MARTYRDOM OF LADY FATIMA ZAHRA

FACT OR FICTION?

Sayyid Mujtaba Aseeri

Translator:
Sayyid Athar Husain S. H. Rizvi

شبهات فاطمیه

سید مجتبی عصیری

السلام علیک یا فاطمة الزهراء علیها السلام

بسم الله الرحمن الرحیم
انا اعطیناک الکوثر

ANSARIYAN PUBLICATIONS
P.O. Box 187
22, Shohada Str. - Qum
Islamic Republic of Iran
Tel: 0098 251 7741744 Fax 7742647
Email: Int_ansarian@yahoo.com
www.ansariyan.org & www.ansariyan.ir

ISBN:978-964-219-248-9

MARTYRDOM OF LADY FATIMA ZAHRA

FACT OR FICTION?

22 references from books acceptable to Wahabis regarding martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s)
22 objections of Wahabis to the martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s); and their replies

Sayyid Mujtaba Aseeri

Translator:
Sayyid Athar Husain S. H. Rizvi

عصیری، مجتبی، ۱۳۴۹ -
Aseeri, Mujtaba,
شبهات فاطمیه (۲۲ سند از کتاب‌های مورد قبول وهابیت در شهادت حضرت فاطمه علیها السلام/۲۲شبهه وهابیت به همراه پاسخ در موضوع شهادت حضرت فاطمه علیها السلام). انگلیسی.
Martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra fact or fictions?/ by Mujtaba Aseeri, translator Athar Husain S. H. Rizvi.-Qum: Ansariyan, 2012=1390.
288 P
ISBN: 978-964-219-248-9
فهرستنویسی بر اساس اطلاعات فیپا.
انگلیسی. کتابنامه. نمایه.
۱. فاطمه زهرا(س)، ۱۸ قبل از هجرت - ۱۱ق. -- شهادت. ۲. فاطمه زهرا(س)، ۱۸ قبل از هجرت - ۱۱ق. -- شهادت -- دفاعیه‌ها و ردیه‌ها. ۳. وهابیه - دفاعیه‌ها و ردیه‌ها.
الف. رضوی، اطهر حسین .Rizvi, Athar Husain S. H، مترجم. ب. عنوان.
BP۲۷/۲/ع٦ش٤٩٥٢٠٤
۲۹۷/۹۷۳
۱۳۹۰
شماره کتابشناسی ملی: ۲٦۰۰٤۷٤

شبهات فاطمیه

MARTYRDOM OF LADY FATIMA ZAHRA(SA)

FACT OR FICTIONS?

22 references from books acceptable to Wahabis regarding martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s)
22 objections of Wahabis to the martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s); and their replies

Author: Sayyid Mujtaba Aseeri
Translated by: Sayyid Athar Husain S.H. Rizvi
Publisher: Ansariyan Publications
Third Reprint: 1433 - 1390 - 2012
Ofuq Press
Quantity: 1000
No of Pages: 288
Size: 148X210 mm
ISBN: 978-964-219-248-9

ALL RIGHTS RECORDED AND RESERVED FOR THE PUBLISHER

ANSARIYAN PUBLICATIONS
P.O. Box 187
22 Shohada St., Qum
Islamic Republic of Iran
Tel: 0098 251 7741744 Fax: 7742647
Email: Int_ansarian@yahoo.com
www.ansariyan.net & www.ansariyan.ir

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH,
THE MOST BENEFICENT, THE MERCIFUL

DEDICATION

In the Name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful

To you, O daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s); O mother of Hasan and Husain; O the most truthful lady, the martyr, the oppressed, the dispossessed, the persecuted and the exploited.

A humble presentation along with a bouquet of Jasmine flowers presented at the unknown tomb of the beloved daughter of the Prophet, being of Haider [Imam Ali] and intercessor of Judgment Day...

Days of relief will come for weary lovers.

Savior of universe, refuge of those who don't have any refuge, will surely come.

Don't be aggrieved, O Fatima! O the lady with broken ribs!

Your Mahdi will definitely come with the ointment of relief.

O Allah, hasten the reappearance of Your beloved representative (*Wali*).

CONTENTS

Foreword—7

Preamble—8

Introduction—11

PART ONE:
AUTHENTIC SOURCES AND REFERENCES ON ATTACK UPON THE HOUSE OF REVELATION

Preliminary—13

Prediction of the Messenger of Allah (s) about martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) in Ahle Sunnat sources—20

Third attack on the house of revelation in Ahle Sunnat sources—27

Some references of attack on the house of revelation and martyrdom of Lady Zahra—30

PART TWO:
OBJECTIONS AND REPLIES

Objection 1: If Fatima (s) was initially angry at Abu Bakr and Umar, she reconciled during her final days—89

Objection 2: Nocturnal burial of Fatima (s) was due to another cause—96

Objection 3: Arab modesty does not permit oppression on Fatima—101

Objection 4: Report of 'Fatima is a part of me' was regarding proposal of Ali (a) to the daughter of Abu Jahl—114

Secondary Objection 5—126

Secondary Objection 6—127

Objection 7: If Fatima (s) was attacked why Ali (a) did not defend her?—130

Objection 8: If Fatima (s) was attacked, why Bani Hashim did not defend her?—144

Objection 9: Lady Zahra (s) also objected to Ali (a)—149

Secondary Objection 10: Is it allowed for an infallible to pray for death?—157

Objection 11: How did the modesty of Ali (a) allow that Fatima should go behind the door?—159

Objection 12: If rivalry existed, why Ali (a) named his sons Umar, Abu Bakr and Uthman?—166

Objection 13: Why before year 71 the term of martyrdom was not present in the calendar?—173

Objection 14: Houses of Mecca and Medina were not having doors—178

Objection 15: Umar only threatened and did nothing else—184

Objection 16: Ali (a) conceded his right; why you Shia do not concede it?—189

Objection 17: Shia consider their opponents to be of illegitimate birth—195

Objection 18: If the claim of Shia had been valid, Ali (a) would not have cooperated with the Caliphs—205

Objection 19: How is it possible for Ali (a) to give the hand of his daughter to the killer of his wife?—218

Objection 20: Ayatullah Khoei has denied attack on Fatima's house—254

Objection 21: Shia, due to their cursing and abusing of companions, become disbelievers—255

Objection 22: Did the Messenger of Allah (s) possess sonography facility?—276

Tragedies of Days of Fatima—286

Epilogue—288

FOREWORD

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

Praise to Allah, whose worth cannot be described by speakers, whose bounties cannot be counted by calculators and whose claim (to obedience) cannot be satisfied by those who attempt to do so, whom the height of intellectual courage cannot appreciate, and the divings of understanding cannot reach; He for whose description no limit has been laid down, no eulogy exists, no time is ordained and no duration is fixed. He brought forth creation through His Omnipotence, dispersed winds through His Compassion, and made firm the shaking earth with rocks.

He is the One, who through His grace, did not leave the creatures confused and bewildered and sent messengers of guidance and warning along with miracles and clear signs, so that they may help them to remind the forgotten covenant made to Allah at the beginning of creation.

And salutations and benedictions on the best of creatures: Muhammad Mustafa (s), with whom prophethood and messengership has ended; and on his pure and chosen family; and everlasting curse on their enemies till Judgment Day.[1]

---

[1] Based on words of Amirul Momincen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) from *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermon 1 and preface of the book, *Al-Imamah wat Tabsira*, Ibne Babawayh Qummi (d. 329 A.H.), father of Shaykh Saduq (d. 381 A.H.).

PREAMBLE

My Prophet is the same one, who was made a target of ridicule by the wretched and jealous people and called as *Abtar* (heirless); but Almighty Allah rendered the ridicule of the jealous ineffective and bestowed Kauthar (abundance); and who other than Fatima, was more eligible for Kauthar?

The concealed conscience inquires: What was the fate of the Kauthar of the Prophet? No tragic remembrances have been read or heard? No pages of her life have turned the leaf and shed tears on her victimization? Can anyone imagine the sorrow of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) on the tragedy of her father? Have they heard the wails of her House of Grief (*Baitul Ahzaan*) with the ears of conscience? What in fact was the end of the dearest one of the Prophet and beloved of Haider (Imam Ali)?

The tragic fate of the only daughter of the Prophet is the beginning of many unsaid things. In heart rending sorrow of Ali (a), when Fatima (s) was crushed between the door and the wall; at the place of washing the bruised face and broken ribs of Fatima, no expert gnostic can estimate the grief of Ali (a) and recognize the sorrow of creation.

It is heart rending that burning flames reduced the heart to ashes, caused tears to flow, broke up the pen and wails arose from depths of the soul upto the heavens.

Asma, where are you? Why did you withdraw your hand from water? You cannot do it like Ali before reddened eyes; and Hasan and Husain kept their heads on the wall in consternation and rubbed their faces on the wall dust. Asma, tell us that when angels washed in tears of Ali for miracle cure, how they burnt their wings and feathers?

Alas, the pen cannot describe the calamities of Fatima and the sorrowful tears of Ali at the time of washing her wounded body.

How the fragility of pens with the passage of time and after the martyrdom of that lady, weaved fictions in history that reality became dust smeared, pains of Lady Zahra (s) became unmentionable and facts became clouded!

Our aim in this dissertation is to bring to the fore some facts, which were previously concealed in history and to make sketches of the incident, which was tried to be distorted, changed, denied or concealed; in order to purify human conscience and remove from it every kind of bigotry and partiality, thus enabling it to judge the tragedies that occurred in history.

...this pen is alone and it confesses helplessness in sketching the true picture of the victimization of Lady Fatima Zahra (s).

Perhaps you may read it and by secret grace explain to others; carry a part of the burden as gift to the chief of the ladies of the world; join the followers of Fatima and earn her intercession.

This locust leg is a gift from the ant, presented to Sulaiman of the kingdom of existence; one who will come to avenge the slapping of his mother. It is a treasure trove for the day of grief when hands would be empty and eyes would be focused on His mercy and kindness; that what He accepts; as all we have is bestowed by Him.

By His blessings is piety sustained and by His being the heavens and the earth are stable.

A green leaf is a gift from dervish. What can the poor man do, he doesn't have anything else!

"And with none but Allah is the direction of my affair to a right issue; on Him do I rely and to Him do I turn." (11:88)

We said: O Ali, and the adoration began.

Sayyid Mujtaba Aseeri[1]
Friday, 30/10/89 corresponding to 15 Safar al-Muzaffar

NOTES

[1] This book is fourth in the series on ideology and some of these points were explained in previous works and by the will of Allah, the Mighty and High. some points will be completed in the coming books. From this aspect the preparation of our previous books (*Shakh Shaitan* [second edition]: Techniques of debating with Wahabis and *Payambar Wahabiyat*) in step with our future works, can satisfy the curiosity of the readers.

It is hoped that we can soon present to seekers of excellence and reality complete series on ideology with regard to the objections of Wahabis and their replies.

INTRODUCTION

Objections, even though they seem amusing, are very deceptive and dangerous. Their implication is difficult and their refutation is tougher. Identifying objections in the writing of a person requires complete awareness of his mentality. Most complex objections are objections, which are in form of research and investigations, about which it is declared that its author and publisher is a researcher and a curious student of that subject.

This category of objections cannot directly take the form of denial of facts; on the contrary, the technique is that the reader should be put into doubt and bewilderment and in the end should be enticed to deny the facts without self awareness. Such types of objections are spread by Wahabis regarding different subjects.

The matter of attack on the house of revelation[1] and the happenings that occurred on that black day,[2] the result of which was the tragic martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s), was the greatest elegy of the history of humanity. This undeniable fact is a heart rending story and some of the calamities that befell Lady Fatima Zahra (s) are especially related to it.

Some have doubted this fact due to lack of awareness about traditions and history, and they beat the drums of denial. On the other hand, since Ahle Sunnat sources – due to bigoted motives – have been content to record the matter as 'only a warning' of Umar to burn down the house of Her Eminence, Fatima, Shia scholars are also compelled to base their reasonings on the subject of warning. Now this created doubt in minds of some people that the actual burning down of the door of Lady Zahra (s) is something, which even Shia scholars don't accept.

So that the lamp lighted by God must not be put out by puffs of objections,[3] it is our duty to respond to the objections of this group and expose the justifiers of regrettable history and deniers of this definite historical reality.

NOTES

[1] House of Lady Fatima Zahra (s).

[2] 'Thursday Tragedy' is mentioned three times in *Sahih Bukhari* and twice in *Sahih Muslim*. It is mentioned in this report that whenever Ibne Abbas, a senior companion of the Prophet, mentioned this incident, tears fell from his eyes and he used to say: Thursday! O what a Thursday!

Thursday, and what about Thursday? Then tears began to flow until I saw them on his cheeks as it they were the strings of pearls. He (the narrator) said that Allah's Messenger (peace be on him) said: Bring me a shoulder blade and ink-pot (or tablet and inkpot), so that I write for you a document (by following which) you would never go astray. They said: Allah's Messenger (peace be on him) is in the state of unconsciousness.

Sahih Muslim, Vol. 3, Pg. 1259, Tr. no. 1637, Kitabul Wasiyya, Chapter 5, Chapter of "He who has not anything with him to will away should not do it" Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[3] *"They desire to put out the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will perfect His light, though the unbelievers may be averse." (Surah Saff 61:8)*

PART ONE
AUTHENTIC SOURCES AND REFERENCES ON ATTACK UPON THE HOUSE OF REVELATION

PRELIMINARY

Statements of some Wahabi scholars are as follows:

We believe that this matter [attack on the house of revelation and martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s)] is the greatest allegation and falsehood of history. To prove this matter, a detailed discusssion can be held, which we are content to state in a few sentences:

Quraish ansd Bani Hashim were considered the most prominent and powerful Arab tribes; in such a way that everyone accepted their precedence and if an enemy attacked one of them, they immediately united and took revenge. Now, the question arises that why Quraish and Bani Hashim did not put up any defense in response to attack on the house of His Eminence, Ali – may Allah honor his visage – and killing of the beloved daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s)?[1]

Most strange of all, why did His Eminence, Ali, the lion of Allah, the conqueror of Khayber, remain quiet and did not raise even the slightest objection? If we accept this falsehood, it would cast aspersion on His Eminence, Ali – may Allah honor his visage.[2]

A. the lady and family members of every person are under his protection; His Eminence Ali (a) was under obligation to defend all the oppressed and especially his lady family members. Why His Eminence, Ali – may Allah honor his visage – did not defend his wife, the daughter of the Prophet?[3]

B. In case we accept the correctness of this matter, which is fabricated by the enemies of Islam, with attention to this holy verse:

"And do not incline to those who are unjust, lest the fire touch you..." (Surah Hud 11:113)

With what justification did His Eminence Ali (a) render his support to the oppressors, prayed behind them and assisted them on all occasions?[4]

C. Why His Eminence, Ali (a) – may Allah honor his visage – married his daughter Umme Kulthum (daughter of Fatima) to Umar? How did that daughter agree to sleep in the same bedroom as the killer of her mother?[5]

D. Among the valuable sayings of His Eminence, Husain (r) is that he said: Far from us is degradation. In case we accept this great falsehood, is there degradation greater than that the enemy of Ali – may Allah honor his visage – should tie up his hands, beat up his wife and that he (Ali) should does not raise the slightest objection?[6]

E. In case we accept that all this oppression occurred on Ali – may Allah honor his visage – he not only remained silent, on the contrary, he gave his daughter as tribute and bribe; and cooperated with them. Why Husain (r) staged an uprising against the unfortunate Yazid, who did nothing to him? What crime had Yazid committed?[7]

F. If just for supposition sake such a thing [attack on the house of revelation and martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s)] did happen and Ali – may Allah honor his visage – himself overlooked it and did not say anything about it, why you Shia become advocates on his behalf and harp upon these matters?[8]

G. Generally the first follower of every religion is the best, like the disciples were the best supporters of Prophet Isa (a) and religion of Christ, why one having such a belief should put himself into trouble and voice support for Islam? Is it not better for him to create a better religion for himself, because the religion of Islam has spread through the same people?[9]

H. Probably it was in the year 71 that some experts and researchers of the Islamic Republic, who were members of Parliament (*Majlis Shura*), after 1400 years they suddenly discovered an important secret that Her Eminence, Fatima, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) did not die, on the contrary, she was martyred. It was at this point that they announced that from now on the term 'death' would be replaced by 'martyrdom' in the calendar and it was from that point of time onwards that they declared it to be a holiday.[10]

It is due to this that we consider this matter [attack on the house of revelation and martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s)] to be without any authentic evidence and source.[11] And we consider it to be a great plot of the enemies of Islam and a blow to Islamic unity to create a deep rift in the rows of Muslims.[12]

The above statements are propagated while the martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) is an undeniable fact as proved from Sunni and Shia sources, but since debate and reasoning demands that we rely only on evidences and testimonies of the opponents themselves, we can present piles of tradition and history books inspite of the efforts of rulers and tyrants to destroy and distort them. As for Shia references, we would need seventy loads of paper if we were to talk of Shia books of tradition and history on this topic.[13]

It is due to the secret grace of the Almighty Allah and the miracle of Her Eminence, Lady Fatima (s) that sufficient authentic and reliable traditional reports are available to prove the claim of Shia; so much so that there is no need of Shia books; it is only sufficient that a person should be conscientious enough not to deny something as obvious as the shining sun on a bright day.

In view of Shia and Sunni, there exist authentic reports that Abu Bakr sent some companions to the house of Lady Fatima

Zahra (s) among whom Umar bin Khattab was also present. Another group of authentic traditions have mentioned invasion on the house of revelation. This is in addition to the authoritative and widely related traditional reports present in Shia sources, which prove that the beloved daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) was attacked, her ribs were fractured and her unborn son was aborted.

NOTES

[1] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 8 [If Fatima (s) was attacked, why Bani Hashim did not defend her?]

[2] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 7 [If Fatima (s) was attacked, why Ali (a) did not defend her?]

[3] We seek the refuge of Almighty Allah and apologize to Ali (a) for repeating the audacious and insulting statement of Wahabi scholars regarding Amirul Momineen (a).

[4] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 18 [If the claim of Shia had been valid, Ali (a) would not have cooperated with the Caliphs]

[5] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 19 [How is it possible for Ali (a) to give the hand of daughter to the killer of his wife?]

[6] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 7 [If Fatima (s) was attacked, why Ali (a) did not defend her?]

[7] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 7 [If Fatima (s) was attacked, why Ali (a) did not defend her?]

[8] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 16 [Ali (a) conceded his right; why you Shia do not concede it?]

[9] See the reply to this objection in the book of *Shakh Shaitan*. by the same author, Pg. 128, Second edition. Part three, under the footnote under the topic of literary, terminological and Islamic meaning of Salfiyyah.

[10] The reply to this objection can be read under Objection 13 [Why before year 71, the term of martyrdom was not present in the calendar?]

[11] Part one of this book mentions the references and sources of the martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and most of them are accepted as authentic on the basis of science of narrators.

[12] It must be stated that the above points were condensed from the senseless propaganda on Ahle Sunnat websites. We have also omitted some very caustic statements lest it hurt the feelings of Shia and have only mentioned the basic points. For more details you can see: http://www.ahlesonnat.blogsky.com

[13] Among the definite principles accepted by all intellectuals is the

rule of *Ilzaam*. That is you must convince the opponent through his own beliefs.

This principle, which is concluded from clear text of tradition in precisely the same words from Imam Kazim (a) is the basis of all courts of law in the world and on its basis judgments are delivered.

In such a way that if a person has accepted a set of principles, then another person in whose view those principles may not be correct, can argue with him on that basis.

For example if the accused admits in the court of law that his dress in fact belongs of Mr. Zaid, and at the same he claims that the ring of Mr. Zaid in fact belongs to the accused. In this case the judge can, on the basis of the rule of 'confession' take away the dress from the accused and hand it over to Mr. Zaid, but with regard to his claim about the ring; he would be asked to provide proof of the same and the accused cannot say that since you accepted my confession regarding the dress, you must accept my claim about the ring as well.

The Holy Quran has emphasized the same style in debating with ideological opponents and asked the Jews to bring the proof of their claims from Taurat: "*Say: Bring then the Taurat and read it, if you are truthful." (3:93)*

Ibne Hazm Andulasi, an important Sunni scholar, who died in 548 A.H. has also explained the same point:

We (Ahle Sunnat) cannot argue with others on the basis of our own traditional reports; because they will not accept; just as others cannot debate with us on the basis of their own traditional reports. Thus. it is necessary that both sides should argue through reports, which are accepted by the opposite side.

Al-Fasl Fil Milal wal Ahwa wan Nahl, Vol. 4, Pg. 78, Ali bin Ahmad bin Saeed bin Hazm Tahiri Abu Muhammad (d. 548), Maktabe Khanji – Cairo.

However the matter that is generally objected to by the opponents is that the traditional reports in question have been cut up from the side of Shia, into pieces and they accept only some selected parts. Either you must not argue through the report at all or you should accept the whole of it and argue through it. With attention to what was stated above this statement contravenes the principle mentioned and such objection cannot be accepted from the opposite party.

It must be mentioned that this principle is true when reports and claim are unrelated and its centre and conclusion is not about one and the same matter.

More details regarding this, along with other matters can be referred in the book of *Aadaab Munazira ba Wahabiyyat* in four parts by the same author.

THE HOLY PROPHET'S PREDICTION OF LADY FATIMAH'S MARTYRDOM IN AHLE SUNNAT SOURCES

Discussion about the attack on the house of revelation and martyrdom of the Lady of the two worlds, Her Eminence, Fatima Zahra (s) has started again after sometime. It can be concluded from reliable traditional reports that this matter, for the first time, was mentioned by the Holy Prophet (s). For example, it is possible to reason through the following report about which we shall discuss in detail at a later stage:

Juwaini[1] (d. 730 A.H.) – Ahle Sunnat scholars call him Imam of the Two sanctuaries (*Imamul Harmain*) and Imam Juwaini and is having a position of a person like Dhahabi[2]; he has narrated from the Messenger of Allah (s) as follows:

When I see Fatima (s), I am reminded of the tragedies that are to befall her after my passing away. As if I can see with my own eyes, that disrespect has entered her house, her sanctity is destroyed, her right has been usurped; she is deprived of her inheritance, her side is broken and her unborn son is killed in the womb; she wails: O Muhammada, but no one comes for her rescue...Fatima would be my first family member to join me after being aggrieved and oppressed and after being martyred.[3]

FIRST ATTACK ON THE HOUSE OF REVELATION IN AHLE SUNNAT SOURCES

When the people of Saqifah realized that in absence of the allegiance of Amirul Momineen (a), Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and a group of companions, the pillars of their regime were shaky and on the verge of collapse, they decided to besiege the house of revelation and take allegiance of Ahle Bayt of the Prophet at any rate.

Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari writes:

> Umar came to Abu Bakr and said: Will you not take allegiance from this disobedient man (Amirul Momineen)? Abu Bake said to Qunfadh, his freed slave: Go to Ali and tell him to come here. Qunfadh came to Ali (a); His Eminence said: What do you want? Qunfadh replied: The successor of the Prophet has summoned you. His Eminence said: How soon have you attributed falsehood to the Messenger of Allah (s)! Qunfadh returned to Abu Bakr and reported the statement of Ali (a). Abu Bakr wept for a long time. Umar said to Abu Bakr the second time: Don't condone one who refuses to pay allegiance. Abu Bakr said to Qunfadh the second time: Go to Ali and tell him that the successor of the Prophet is calling him to pay allegiance. Qunfadh conveyed the message of Abu Bakr to Ali (a). Amirul Momineen (a) said in aloud voice: Glory be to Allah! He (Abu Bakr) claims Caliphate and successorship of the Prophet, whereas this post is not for him. Qunfadh came back to Abu Bakr and conveyed the statement of Ali (a). Abu Bakr wept for a long time.[4]

Balazari writes in *Ansabul Ashraf:*

> Abu Bakr sent for Ali to take allegiance from him and when Ali (a) refused, Umar came...[5]

Alusi Wahabi has also quoted this report from the book of Aban bin Ayyash and has not doubted its genuineness:

> When people paid allegiance to Abu Bakr and Ali did not give allegiance, Abu Bakr sent Qunfadh to Ali (a) saying: Go to Ali and tell him to accept the Caliph of the Messenger of Allah (s). Qunfadh came to Ali (a) and conveyed the message of Abu Bakr. Ali (a) said:

> How soon you have attributed falsehood to the Prophet of Allah and apostasied. By Allah, the Prophet did not appoint anyone for Caliphate, except me...[6]

SECOND ATTACK ON THE HOUSE OF REVELATION IN AHLE SUNNAT SOURCES

In the second attack, the enemies after burning down the door of the house of revelation and audacity against the sanctity of Her Eminence, Siddiqa Tahira (a), due to a severe confrontation with Amirul Momineen (a), did not succeed in taking His Eminence to the Masjid for giving allegiance.

Alusi Wahabi has also narrated this report from the book of Aban bin Ayyash and has not rejected its genuineness:

> In the same way, it is mentioned in the book of Aban that when Abu Bakr sent for Ali (a) to come pay allegiance and Ali (a) did not accept it, Umar became infuriated and set fire to the door of Ali (a) and entered the house. Lady Fatima Zahra (s) confronted him and cried: O my father, O Messenger of Allah (s)! Umar raised his sheathed sword and hit the side of Fatima and also lashed her arm. At this moment, the wail of Fatima rose up: O my father! Ali (a) suddenly arose from his place and caught the collar of Umar and threw him to the ground hard; he gave him a severe blow on the nose and neck...[7]

Shahristani (d. 545 A.H.), a Sunni scholar, says:

> Nazzam has said: On the day of allegiance, Umar hit at the belly of Fatima, which caused miscarriage. Umar screamed: I will burn down this house with all who are in it. It was at a time when there was no one in the house, except Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain (a)...and the miscarriage of Mohsin (a) occurred.[8]

Masudi Shafei, commonly known as Taqiuddin Subaki, whose name is included among Shafei scholars in the book, *Al-Tabaqatush Shafiya*,[9] has mentioned in *Asbatul Wasiyyah:*

> ...they headed to the house of Ali (a) and attacked it. They burnt down the door of Ali (a); they pulled him out forcibly and crushed the leader of the ladies of the world behind the door and caused the miscarriage of her Mohsin.[10]

Ibne Abi Shaybah (d. 239 A.H. lunar) – a teacher of Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari – writes in the book of *Musannaf:*

> When people paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, Ali and Zubair were in a huddle, in the house of Fatima. This was reported to Umar bin Khattab. He came to the door of Fatima and said: O daughter of the Messenger of Allah, by Allah, your father was the most beloved person for us and after him it was you; but this love will not prevent me from ordering the burning down of this place along with its inmates, if these people gather here. Umar made this remark and went away. When Ali (a) and Zubair returned, the honorable daughter of the Prophet said to Ali (a) and Zubair: Umar came and swore that if you again hold a meeting here, he would burn down the house on you; by Allah, he would indeed do what he has sworn.[11]

Balazari writes in *Ansabul Ashraf:*

> Abu Bakr sent for Ali (a) to pay allegiance to him and when he refused to pay the allegiance, Umar went to the house of Fatima (s) with a burning torch. Fatima came behind the door and called: O son of Khattab, do you want to burn down the door of my house? Umar replied: Yes, this would strengthen the religion of your father.[12]

Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari writes:

> Abu Bakr inquired about those who were with Ali (a) and who refused to pay allegiance to him and when he learnt that they had conglomerated in the house of Ali (a), he sent Umar to them; Umar came to the door of Ali (a) and called them to come out and pledge allegiance to Abu Bakr, but they refused. Umar called for firewood and said: By Allah, in whose hand is my life, if you don't come out I would burn down the house with its occupants. They said to him: O Umar, Fatima is present in this house. He said: Even if Fatima is present in it, I will do what I have decided to. At this moment all came out, except Ali (a), and paid allegiance. It seems that Ali (a) took an oath that he would not put on his cloak (to leave the house) till he has collected the Quran. Fatima (s) stood behind the door and said: For me, seeing any people is not as bad and detestable as seeing you. You left the dead body of the Messenger of Allah (s) on our hands, divided up Caliphate among yourself, and in this regard made no inquiries and did not restore our rights to us.[13]

It is mentioned in *Tarikh Tabari*:

> Umar came to the house of Ali (a) while Talha, Zubair and a group of *Muhajireen* were present there, and he said: By Allah, come out of the house to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr, otherwise I would burn down the place...[14]

NOTES

[1] Juwaini's position according to Ahle Sunnat:

Dhahabi has mentioned his teacher, Juwaini as follows:

"Juwaini is Imam, leader, extraordinary and perfect traditionist, pride of Islam and an honest and righteous person.

Tadkirah Huffaz, Vol. 4, Pg. 1, No, 1. Teachers of the author of *Tadkirah*, Abu Abdullah Shamsuddin Muhammad Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

In the same way, he says in another place:

He is the Imam of traditional reports and traditions, uniquely perfect, source of pride for Islam, chief of religion, Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Mobad bin Hamya Khorasani Juwaini...according to traditional reports and available books of traditions, he is having much importance. He had a nice voice, elegant face, he is awesome and religious. *Tadkiratul Huffaz*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1, No. 24, Abu Abdullah Shamsuddin Muhammad Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

[2] Dhahabi's position according to Ahle Sunnat: Dhahabi is an incomparable personality among scholars of Ahle Sunnat, a very lofty position and high rank of a rare kind. He was born in 673 A.H. in the Kufr Batna province in the area of Damascus (d. 748 A.H.), he was able to learn traditions by heart and he dedicated his whole life to it. Views of Dhahabi are considered very reliable in most tradition and history books and he is called as the historian of Islam and Imam of traditionists. Sobki has written about him:

Dhahabi is the traditionist of the time, leader of the memorizers of traditions, he was aware of the various aspects of the science of traditions; he was the standard bearer of Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat, leader of his time in the science of memorization and criticism of traditions; he was a unique personality of his times; and all have admitted to his capabilities.

Tabaqatus Shafiya, Vol. 3, Pg. 57, Abu Bakr bin Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Umar bin Qazi Shahba (d. 751), Aalamul Kutub, Beirut, 1407; First edition. Edited: Dr. Hafiz Abdul Aleem Khan.

[3] *Faraidus Simtain*, Vol. 2, Pg. 35, Chapter 7, Tradition. No. 371, Imam Juwaini (d. 730 A.H.), Al-Mahmoodi.

[4] *Al-Imamah was Siyasah,* Vol. 1, Pg. 19-20, Chapter of How the allegiance of Ali (a) took place. Edited: Muhammad Zaini

[5] *Ansabul Ashraf,* Balazari, Vol. 1, Pg. 586

[6] *Ruhul Maani fee Tafsirul Quranil Azeem wa Saba Mathani*, Vol. 3, Pg. 124, Allamah Abul Fadhl Shahabuddin Sayyid Mahmud Alusi Baghdadi (d. 1270 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[7] *Ruhul Maani fee Tafsirul Quranil Azeem wa Saba Mathani*, Vol. 3, Pg. 124, Allamah Abul Fadhl Shahabuddin Sayyid Mahmud Alusi Baghdadi (d. 1270 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[8] *Al-Milal wan Nihal*. Vol. 1, Pg. 316, Muhammad bin Abdul Karim bin Abi Bakr Ahmad Shahristani (d. 548 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut. 1404, Edited: Muhammad Sayyid Gilani.

[9] *Tabaqatul Fuqaha Shafiya*, Vol. 1, Pg. 207, Taqiuddin Abu Aamir Uthman bin Abdur Rahman bin al-Salah (d. 643 A.H.), Darul Bashair al-Islamiya, Beirut, 1992 A.D., First edition; Edited: Mohiuddin Ali Najib.

[10] *Asbatul Wasiyya*, Masudi, Pg. 143

[11] *Al-Kitabul Musannaf fee al-Ahadith wal Aathaar*, Vol. 7, Pg. 432, Tradition no. 37045, Kitabul Maghazi, Chapter of what occurred during the Caliphate of Abu Bakr and his role in Ridda wars, Ibne Abu Shaybah Kufi, Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad (d. 235 A.H.), Edited: Kamaal Yusuf Alhut; Maktabe Rushd, Riyadh, First edition, 1409 A.H.

Jamiul Ahadith (Al-Jame Saghir, additions and *Jamiul Kabir*), Vol. 13, Pg. 267, Jalaluddin Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr Suyuti.

Kanzul Ummal fee Sunanul Aqwaal wa Afaal, Vol. 5, Pg. 259, Alauddin Ali Muttaqi bin Husamuddin Hindi (d. 975 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Umar Ad-Damiyati, Darul Kitabul Ilmiyya Beirut, First edition, 1490 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[12] *Ansabul Ashraf,* Balazari, Vol. 1, Pg. 586

[13] *Al-Imamah was Siyasah,* Vol. 1, Pg. 19, Chapter of How the allegiance of Ali (a) took place. Edited: Muhammad Zaini

[14] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 233, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.

THIRD ATTACK ON THE HOUSE OF REVELATION IN AHLE SUNNAT SOURCES

After two attacks on the house of revelation and the opposition, which appeared against Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and Amirul Momineen (a) this time it occurred in a more blatant manner and they attacked the sanctity of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and took His Eminence, Ali (a) to the Masjid forcibly.

It was in this attack that Lady Fatima Zahra (s) was injured at the hands of Qunfadh. It was in such a way that Fatima stood behind the door between people and Amirul Momineen (a). The accursed Qunfadh hit her with a lash in such a way that Lady Zahra (s) passed away due to that same effective strike, which left a bruise on her arm like an arm band. It was in the same attack that miscarriage of His Eminence, Mohsin (a) occurred and he was martyred. May Allah curse Qunfadh and his sender.

When Ibne Abde Rabb Mutazali (d. 328 A.H.), in his book, *Iqdul Farid*, lists the names of those who did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr, he says:

They were Ali, Abbas, Zubair and Saad bin Ubadah, but Ali, Abbas and Zubair remained in the house of Fatima. Abu Bakr asked Umar to go to them and bring them out and if they resist, they must be brought out forcibly. Umar set out for the house of Fatima carrying a burning torch. When Fatima (s) saw this, she cried: O son of Khattab, have you brought fire to burn down my place? He replied: Yes, if you don't enter that in which the Ummah has entered (allegiance of Abu Bakr)...[1]

The same incident is mentioned in *Tarikh Abul Fida* in the following way:

> Abu Bakr sent Umar to Ali and his companions in order to bring them out of the house of Fatima; Abu

> Bakr ordered Umar that if they refused and resisted he was to fight them. Umar came with some fire to them to burn down the house. When Fatima (s) saw Umar in this condition, she said: O son of Khattab, where are you hastening to in this way? Have you come to burn down my house? Umar said: Yes, except if you do that which people have done.[2]

In the same way, Balazari has written in *Ansabul Ashraf*:

> ...Ibne Abbas says: During the time of allegiance of Abu Bakr, when Ali (a) did not pay allegiance to him, he sent Umar bin Khattab to Ali (a), saying: Bring Ali to me in the most severe and worst manner possible. On the way Ali (a) and Umar had an altercation. Ali (a) said to Umar: Milk the camel of Caliphate, your share is secure. By Allah, your greed for assuring rulership for Abu Bakr is there, because he will nominate you as his successor...[3]

MARTYRDOM OF HIS EMINENCE, MOHSIN IN THE THIRD ATTACK

Martyrdom of His Eminence, Mohsin (a) occurred after the audacity during the third attack on the only reminder (daughter) of the Messenger of Allah (s).

Dhahabi, about whose reliability and special status among Ahle Sunnat we mentioned before, in the account of Ahmad bin Muhammad Sari, says:

Umar hit Fatima in such a way that Mohsin was miscarried.[4]

Safdi says:

> On the day of allegiance, Umar hit on the belly of Fatima and caused miscarriage of Mohsin.[5]

In the same way is the report that was previously quoted by Juwaini, teacher of Dhahabi; and we have already discussed in detail their reliability and extraordinary status they command among Ahle Sunnat in the report about prediction of the Messenger of Allah (s) about the calamities that are to befall his daughter, Fatima, including the martyrdom of His Eminence, Mohsin (a):

When I see Fatima (s), I am reminded of the tragedies that are to befall her after my passing away. As if I can see with my own eyes, that disrespect has entered her house, her sanctity is destroyed, her right has been usurped, she is deprived of her inheritance, her side is broken and her unborn son is killed in the womb, she wails: O Muhammada, but no one comes for her rescue...Fatima would be my first family member to join me after being aggrieved and oppressed and after being martyred.[6]

NOTES

[1] *Al-Iqdul Farid*, Vol. 3, Pg. 63; Ibne Abde Rabb, Egypt

[2] *Tarikh Abul Fida*, Vol. 1, Pg. 156, Egypt, Al-Matba Husainia

[3] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Balazari, Vol. 1, Pg. 253, Chapter of Saqifah

[4] *Mizanul Etedal*, Biography no. 551, Ahmad bin Muhammad Sari bin Yahya bin Abi Daram al-Muhaddith, Vol. 1, Pg. 283; *Lisanul Mizan*, Vol. 1, Pg. 268, Biography no. 824, Ahmad bin Muhammad.

[5] *Al-Wafi bil Wafayat*, Vol. 5, Pg. 347

[6] *Faraidus Simtain*, Vol. 2, Pg. 34-35

SOME REFERENCES OF ATTACK ON THE HOUSE OF REVELATION AND MARTYRDOM OF LADY ZAHRA

In this part, we shall present some references of the martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s), although for gaining certainty it is hardly needed to investigate the authorities of a report, which is narrated through so many channels[1], but in spite of that authorities of some reports presented below are investigated by way of examples, so that the way of doubt is closed for excuse makers.

1. Report of Abu Ubaid (224 A.H.)

Abu Ubaid Qasim bin Salam (d. 224 A.H.), who is considered a reliable Islamic jurist, has narrated from Abdur Rahman bin Auf in the book of *Al-Amwal*:

> I visited Abu Bakr in his terminal illness. After preliminaries, he said: I regret having committed three acts and not doing three things, and I also should have asked about three things for the Messenger of Allah (s)...one of the three thing, which I should not have done, is that if only I had not committed that act and had not done it in this and that way. [Alas, if I had not trespassed on the sanctity of the house of Fatima and had not attacked her place][2]...I am not inclined to mention the statement of Abu Bakr...[3]

If Abu Ubaid, due to prejudice or some other reason, has avoided quoting the facts, the researchers of *Al-Amwal* have mentioned in the footnote: The omitted sentence has been quoted by the authors of *Mizanul Etedal, Al-Mojamul Tibrani, Al-Iqdul Farid* and other books, which shall be mentioned in the coming pages.

2. Report of Nazzam (230 A.H.)

Ibrahim bin Sayyar bin Hani, alias Nazzam (d. 230 A.H.), famous philosopher and theologian of Ahle Sunnat, who due to his beautiful discourse in prose and poetry has become famous as Nazzam; he is the founder of the Nazzamiya sect and is from the elders of Mutazila. He is among those who have admitted to the trespassing on the sanctity of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) by the second Caliph of Ahle Sunnat and some other facts and events, which took place in the early period of Islam; but regretfully some Ahle Sunnat scholars have condemned him severely only because he has admitted these facts and without any justification leveled false accusations against him and have even expelled him from the folds of Islam and related him to Brahmanism.[4]

In his numerous books, he has quoted the incident of attack on the house of Lady Zahra (s):

> On the day of allegiance of Abu Bakr, Umar hit at the side of Lady Fatima (s), which led to the miscarriage of her child, who was named as Mohsin.[5]

As was hinted, Nazzam became a target of many allegations due to his explanation of some historical facts, so that naturally by criticism, investigation of accusatory instances and exposing of reality, the allegations laid on him would be removed.[6]

3- Report of Ibne Abi Shaybah (239 A.H.) with correction of reference

He was a teacher of Muhammad Ibne Ismail Bukhari, author of the most authentic book of Ahle Sunnat. He has written in *Al-Musannaf*:

> When people paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, and Ali and Zubair entered into a huddle in the house of Fatima,

this information reached Umar bin Khattab; he came to the house of Fatima and said: O daughter of the Messenger of Allah, by Allah, your father was the most beloved person for us and after him it was you; but by Allah this love will not prevent me from ordering the burning down of this place along with its inmates if these people gather here. Umar made this remark and went away. When Ali (a) and Zubair returned, the honorable daughter of the Prophet said to Ali (a) and Zubair: Umar came and swore that if you again hold a meeting here, he would burn down the house on you; by Allah, he would indeed do what he has sworn.[7]

OBJECTION OF WAHABISM AGAINST THE REPORT OF IBNE ABI SHAYBAH

Abdur Rahman Damishqiya is among the contemporary leaders of Wahabism and he is a famous Wahabi writer as well. In his article hosted at the website: Faisal Noor[8], he has tried to created doubt in the report of Ibne Abi Shaybah and has said that it is having incomplete chains of narrators.

In the article, "Incident of burning down of the house of Fatima by Umar is a fiction" he writes about the report of Ibne Abi Shaybah:

> Report of Ibne Abi Shaybah is having incomplete chain of narrators, because Zaid bin Aslam has quoted traditions with incomplete chains of narrators and his reports are disconnected with Umar just as Ibne Hajar and Albani have also clarified this point. If you (Shia) argue this report, you have invalidated your belief in the burning down of the house of Fatima; in the same way, your belief that Ali did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr also becomes questionable.[9]

By investigating the chain of reporters of this report, the falsehood of Abdur Rahman Damishqiya is exposed soon as he has himself clarified that the report is from Zaid bin Aslam from Umar, because the fact is that Aslam has narrated from his father and he from Umar, and not that Zaid bin Aslam has narrated directly from Umar. On the basis of this, the claim of broken chain of narrators is baseless and thus the chain of narrators of Ibne Abi Shaybah is perfectly correct according to the rules of Ahle Sunnat science of reporters of traditions.[10]

In addition to this, some senior Ahle Sunnat scholars have confessed that the chain of narrators of this report is correct and without any doubt. For example Dr. Hasan bin Farhan Maliki, teacher and researcher of training affairs, learning and development of Saudi Arabia has mentioned as follows regarding the chain of narrators of the report of Ibne Abi Shaybah:

In the beginning I was of the opinion that the incident of attack is false and inauthentic; but after referring and research, I found its clear chains of narrators and one of its chains is the statement of Ibne Abi Shaybah in his book of *Al-Musannaf*. Thus, this agonizing incident was proved true through genuine chain of narrators.[11]

CONSEQUENCES OF THE REPORT OF IBNE ABI SHAYBAH

From this report, even if attack on the house of Lady Zahra (s) and its burning down is not proved, it proves other points and their consequences are not lesser than the matter of attack and it puts a question mark on the Caliphate of some persons. Some of these points are mentioned below:

A: Intention of burning down the house of revelation

This report, in the most positive circumstances proves the intention of Umar to burn down the house of revelation and

the statement of Lady Zahra (s) that: "Umar will definitely carry out his vow," emphasizes the determination of Umar on this act; while the fact is that bad intention against the people of Medina is an unforgivable sin and the Messenger of Allah (s) swore that Almighty Allah would punish such a person in Fire, just as salt dissolves in water.

Muslim Nishapuri in his *Sahih*, in the "chapter of Allah will punish those who intend any harm to the citizens of Medina," has quoted six traditional reports about the chastisement of those who harbor wrong intentions about the people of Medina. By way of example, we present the following reports:

> Allah would efface (in fire) one who intends to harm the people of this city (Medina) as salt dissolves in water.[12]

Now, when the matter regarding the people of Medina is so tough and terrifying, does anyone have any right to make such threats against the sole reminder of the Messenger of Allah (s) and the chief of the ladies of Paradise (s)?

B: Creating terror and fear upon the inmates of the house of revelation

According to the report of Ibne Abi Shaybah, it is proved that people threatened the inmates of the house of revelation. At least, by this act, they terrified the people of Medina as in that case according to the below report they should have a satisfactory reply:

Dhahabi, about whose reliability among Ahle Sunnat, we previously discussed, writes:

> Saib bin Khallad says: I heard the Messenger of Allah (s) say: One who terrifies the people of Medina, Almighty Allah would terrify him, and the curse of Allah, the angels and the people would be on him.[13]

Add to the above report, the report, which we mentioned a little while ago and in the previous part from the book of Muslim Nishapuri regarding one who terrifies the people of Medina.

C: Display of democracy through forced allegiance

Report of Ibne Abi Shaybah proves that allegiance of Abu Bakr was achieved through use of threats and fury; and this was posed as democracy and consensus of companions, agreement of the persons having a say and public allegiance and so on...it was nothing more than fiction and it has only put a question mark on the legality of Abu Bakr's Caliphate, because according to Wahabi approved sources, the Caliph is elected according to public opinion; whereas no such thing is mentioned in this report, because according to it, Abu Bakr was neither appointed by God nor His Messenger and nor the people selected him for Caliphate; on the contrary, he got the Caliphate through force, threats and terror.

D: Opposition of Amirul Momineen (a) and some companions to the ruler of the time

More important than that is the fact that Lady Fatima Zahra (s), Amirul Momineen (a) and companions of Ali (a) were opposed to the Caliphate of the ruler of the time and they considered Caliphate to be a right of Amirul Momineen (a). That is why Amirul Momineen (a) and his companions gathered in the house of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) in order to work out a strategy to take over Caliphate and it was an uprising of Amirul Momineen (a) against consensus on Caliphate of Abu Bakr.

Now, let us pay attention to the statement of Ibne Hazm Andulasi that every consensus in which Amirul Momineen (a) is not included is cursed by God.

> "May God curse the consensus (*Ijma*), which does not have Ali (a) and his companions."[14]

4- REPORT OF ALLAMAH BALAZARI (270 A.H.) WITH CORRECT REFERENCE

Balazari says in *Ansabul Ashraf*:

> Abu Bakr sent for Ali (a) to pay allegiance to him and when he refused to pay the allegiance, Umar went to the house of Fatima (s) with a burning torch. Fatima came behind the door and asked: O son of Khattab, do you want to burn down my door? Umar replied: Yes, this would strengthen the religion of your father.[15]

OBJECTIONS OF WAHABISM TO THE CHAINS OF NARRATORS OF ALLAMAH BALAZARI

Abdur Rahman Damishqiya, whose objection against the report of Ibne Abi Shaybah about the threat of Umar to burn down the house of revelation was mentioned a little while ago, has also expressed doubt in that inappropriate act and on the chain of this report as well in his article and said:

The chain of reporters of this tradition is disconnected on one side and on the other side Sulaiman Teemi is a companion of companions (*Tabii*) and there is a great gap between Balazari and him; how can he quote from him without an intermediary. The objection against this report is that Ibne Aun is the last companion of companions and there was a long gap between him and Abu Bakr.

Research into the chain of narrators of this report clearly shows that this objection of Abdur Rahman Damishqiya accompanied with ridicule and taunts more resembles academic objection, because we claim that this report is also perfectly genuine on the basis of sources of narrators of Ahle Sunnat traditions and if Allah wills, we will prove this claim.[16]

5- REPORT OF IBNE QUTAIBAH DINAWARI (276 A.H.) WITH CORRECTION OF REFERENCE

The report of Ibne Qutaibah is as follows:

> Abu Bakr was in pursuit of some people to take their allegiance as they were not present there to give allegiance to him. And that is why they had gathered with Ali (a). Abu Bakr in order to take allegiance sent Umar after them. Umar went after them and called out to them, but they did not pay any heed and did not come out of the house. Umar called for firewood and said: By Allah, in whose hand is my life if you don't come out I would burn down the house with its occupants. They said to him: O Aba Hafs, Fatima is present in this house. Umar replied: Even if that is the case...In another report it is mentioned: Umar came to the door of the house of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) with a large number of helpers (*Ansar*) and a few emigrants (*Muhajireen*). When Fatima heard them she cried: O father, O Messenger of Allah (s)! What all we did not face at the hand of Ibne Khattab [Umar] and Ibne Abi Qahafa [Abu Bakr]...[17]

The personality of Ibne Qutaibah is so trustworthy in the view of Ahle Sunnat that Ibne Taymiyyah, the founder of Wahabism, has also paid tribute him in very positive terms and he says:

> All the people of Marakkesh considered him respectable and honored him and anyone who had a view opposed to him was considered as heretic and apostate and they said: A house, which does not have a book of Ibne Qutaibah, has no goodness.[18]

With attention to the time of the death of Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari in the third century (276 A.H.), his proximity to the

early period of Islam and the importance of his personality shows that he was a famous intellectual and an elder and leader of Ahle Sunnat in literature, history, jurisprudence, traditions, sciences of Quran and etc...so it is not possible to doubt his veracity and person, that is why they strive to cast aspersions on the reliability of *Al-Imamah was Siyasah.*

Since Wahabis do not have satisfactory proof to prove their weak claim that is why they have presented the statements of orientalists[19] and some weak statements of modern scholars.[20]

6. Report of Mabard (285 A.H.)

Ibne Hadid writes:

> Muslim bin Yazid bin Abdul Akbar Baghdadi (210 to 285) is a famous literary personality and a writer of famous books. In the book of *Al-Kamil*, he has written about the story of aspirations of Abu Bakr quoting from Abdur Rahman Ibne Auf as follows:
>
> Alas, if I had not exposed the house of Fatima and had left it alone, even if I had been forced to war.[21]

Report of Tabari (310 A.H.) with correction of reference

It is mentioned in *Tarikh Tabari*:

> Umar came to the house of Ali (a) while Talha, Zubair and a group of Muhajireen were present there, and he said: By Allah, come out of the house to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr, otherwise I would burn down the place...[22]

Objection of Wahabism to the genuineness of Tabari's report

It is objected to the report of Tabari that this report is problematic due to the weakness of chain of its narrators, because some scholars have claimed that Ibne Humayyad was a liar.

In reply, we say: Difference of opinion with regard to

personality of reporters is natural; therefore, it must be seen what opinions others have about him.

In *Tahdhibul Kamaal* of Mizzi, which is considered to be the most authentic Ahle Sunnat book of science of narrators (*Ilme Rijal*), it is quoted from Yahya bin Moin, who is an authority of Ahle Sunnat science of narrators (*Ilme Rijal*), that he said with regard to Ibne Humayyad:

> He is a reliable person, without any kind of doubt and is a very good narrator.[23]

We also add that those aware of *Ilme Rijal* of Ahle Sunnat testify that no narrator can be found, except that regarding him weakness exists, even with regard to Bukhari, whose book is the most important book of Ahle Sunnat after the Holy Quran; various weaknesses like deceit, hypocrisy and fraud etc. are included in it.[24]

In addition to the above, Abdur Rahman Damishqiya has also raised an objection and said:

> In this traditional report there are doubts: one of them being in the existence of Jarir bin Hazim, although he is an honest person, but sometimes he is involved in doubts and mistakes and as Abu Dawood has said he has mixed together the correct and incorrect reports. Another problem is Mughira bin Muqsam; that in spite of the fact that he is trustworthy, his traditions are having incomplete chains of narrators. Ibne Hajar has also included him in the third category of defrauders in traditions and his reports are not acceptable; except if it is clarified through hearing.[25]

That is why it is necessary to correct the chains of narrators of Tabari also on the basis of *Ilme Rijal* of Ahle Sunnat.[26]

Consequently the chains of narrators of the report of Tabari is

absolutely correct and without any doubt and the objection of Abdur Rahman Damishqiya are all baseless and show his lack of attention and lack of precision about his own sources of science of narrators.

8. Report of Masudi Shafei (345 A.H.)

Masudi has written in *Asbatul Wasiyya*:

> They besieged him and burnt down the door of his house and brought him out of the house forcibly and crushed the chief of the ladies of the world behind the door, leading to the miscarriage of Mohsin.[27]

Taqiuddin Subaki, in the book, *Tabaqatush Shafiya* has mentioned his name in the list of scholars of Shafeite school of thought. Therefore, it definitely disproves that he was a Shia.[28]

9. Report of Tibrani (360 A.H.) and others about the regret of Ahle Bayt (a) with correction of reference

Reports about the regret of Abu Bakr for attacking the house of revelation are narrated by Tibrani, Dhahabi and others:

> It is narrated from Abu Bakr that when he was in his last moments, he said: I do not regret anything, except three things, which I committed...till he said: Alas, if I had not exposed the house of Fatima and had left alone even if I had been forced to war.[29]

It is sufficient to prove the correctness of this report that Ziyauddin Muqaddasi Hanbali, senior Ahle Sunnat scholar says: This tradition from Abu Bakr is of the rank of 'Hasan'.[30]

Ziyauddin Muqaddasi is among the founders of science of narrators (*Ilme Rijal*) and logical reasoning (*Jirah wa Tadeel*) of Ahle Sunnat. Allamah Dhahabi has said about him: He is

the Imam, the learned, the memorizer, the decisive evidence, traditionist of Shaam (Syria) and Shaykh (scholar/teacher) of Ahle Sunnat.[31]

OBJECTION OF WAHABISM TO THE CHAIN OF NARRATORS OF TIBRANI

Abdur Rahman Damishqiya, about whose personality and objections we already know, in the same article: "Incident of burning down of the house of Fatima by Umar is a fiction" on the website: Faisal noor (www.fnoor.com) it is mentioned in it about the report Ibne Abi Shaybah:

In the report of Abu Bakr name of Dawood bin Ulwan Bajali is present, whom Bukhari, Abu Saeed bin Yunus, Ibne Hajar and Uqaili have considered a denier of tradition.[32]

Reply to the objection of Abdur Rahman Damishqiya:

1. Chain of narrators is correct on the basis of science of narrators of Ahle Sunnat and even supposing it is not correct, we shall prove its authenticity through other channels.[33]

The only objection, which can possibly be laid on this report is the presence of Ulwan bin Dawood Bajali in the chain of narrators of this report; which due to the testimony of Ibne Hibban in his book, is also dispelled.[34]

If they say: Ibne Hibban had been latitudinarian and simple minded in verifying the narrators, we say: This claim is not acceptable, because Dhahabi in his book, *Al-Mauqaza fee Ilme Mastilah Hadith*, Pg. 79, says: Source of knowing the trustworthy narrators is *Tarikh Bukhari*, *Ibne Abi Hatim* and *Ibne Hibban*.

And Suyuti has also said:

> One who says with regard to Ibne Hibban: Ibne Hibban was latitudinarian in traditions, his statement is incorrect.[35]

In the same way, it is possible that some might say: Ulwan bin Dawood Bajali was a denier of traditions, so his reports cannot be accepted. In reply to this objection, it can be said: Denial of tradition[36] does not make the reports of the reporters unreliable. Ibne Hajar Asqalani, in the account of Husain bin Fadhl Bajali says:

> If it is ruled that one who has narrated *Munkar* traditions should be included among weak narrators in that case the reports of no one will remain valid.[37]

2. This report is narrated from a number of channels and in only of them is Ulwan bin Dawood present, like Shamsuddin Dhahabi has said after narrating the report:

> This tradition is narrated by Ibne Wahab, Ibne Ayez from Laith bin Saad from Salih bin Kisan in more complete form.[38]

As you can see, the name of Ulwan bin Dawood is not mentioned and Laith bin Saad has directly narrated from Salih bin Kisan.

Ibne Asakir has also narrated the report through this chain:

> Narrated to us Abul Barakat Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Fadhl Farawi and Ummul Moayyad Nazieen, famous as Jumah binte Abi Harb, Muhammad bin Fadhl bin Abi Harb that he said: I, Abul Qasim Fadhl bin Abi Harb Jurjani informed Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Hasan narrated to us Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Yaqub narrated to us Hasan bin Mukarram bin Hasaan Bazar Abu Ali Baghdad narrated to me Abul Haitham Khalid bin Qasim that he said: Laith bin Saad from Salih bin Qisan from Hamid bin Abdur Rahman bin Auf from his father...[39]

In the same way, Balazari in *Ansabul Ashraf* has brought this same report through the below mentioned chain of narrators:

> Narrated to me Hafas bin Umar, Thanaul Haitham bin Adi from Yunus bin Yazid Alaili from Zuhri from Abdur Rahman bin Auf that he said: I came to Abu Bakr in his terminal illness...[40]

On the basis of this, some of these reports are narrated through three different chains; that even if we suppose that each of the chains are difficult even then we cannot ignore their decisive proof; because on the basis of principles of the science of narrators of Ahle Sunnat if a report is narrated through three chains of narrators even if all of them are weak they strengthen each other and they create proof; as Badruddin Aini (died 855 A.H.) has mentioned in *Umdatul Qari* quoting from Muhiuddin Nawawi: Nawawi has mentioned in *Sharh Muhazzab*:

> If reports are narrated through different chains of narrators, but some of their reporters are weak, even then they can be used for reasoning, moreover we say: A number of traditions from companions are narrated from different channels and some of them lend strength to others even though each of those traditions are weak.[41]

The same matter is mentioned by the Imam of Wahabism, Ibne Taymiyyah in *Majmua Al-Fatawa*:

> Numerous channels of quoting traditions, strengthen some of the weak reports, which procures the background of knowledge; even if their reporters are transgressors and sinners; traditions whose all reporters are persons of integrity have a lot of mistakes and doubts in their quotations.[42]

Muhammad Nasir Albani in *Arwaul Ghulail* after quoting the path has mentioned one report:

> Among the proved matters in the science of narrators is that multiple chains of narrators, in case there is no accused person in the chain of reporters, strengthen one another.[43]

Consequently these reports even if they are weak from the aspect of chains of reporters, even then they are decisive proofs and worthy of reasoning.

3. Testimony of Ahle Sunnat scholars on the genuineness of the report:

A. Considering the report to be good by Saeed bin Mansur (d. 227 A.H.):

> Saeed bin Mansur, is among the senior tradition scholars of the third century; he has narrated these reports in his *Sunan* and said that this report is 'Hasan' (good).

Jalaluddin Suyuti in *Jamiul Ahadith* and *Musnad Fatima* and Muttaqi Hindi in *Kanzul Ummal*, after narrating this report, say:

> Abu Ubaid in *Kitabul Amwaal*, Uqaili Tarabulisi in *Fadailus Sahaba*, Tibrani in *Mojamul Kabir*, Ibne Asakir in *Tarikh Medina Damishq* and Saeed bin Mansur in his *Sunan* have narrated these reports and Saeed bin Mansur says: This tradition is 'Hasan' (good) even though it does not have a statement of the Messenger of Allah (s).[44]

Personal confession like that of Saeed bin Mansur in the third century A.H. and his deeming this report to be 'Hasan' shows in the initial Islamic centuries that these report were popular and acceptable among Ahle Sunnat intellectuals.

B. Considering the report to be good by Ziya al-Muqaddasi (d. 643 A.H.):

> Muqaddasi Hanbali is among the famous personages of the seventh century and he was among the senior most Ahle Sunnat traditionists; he has considered this report 'Hasan' (credible) and said:

This report of Abu Bakr is 'Hasan', even though it does not contain a statement of the Messenger of Allah (s).[45]

10. Report of Ibne Abde Rabb (463 A.H.)

Ibne Abde Rabb has written in *Iqdul Farid*:

> Abu Bakr ordered Umar to go and bring out [those who had taken refuge in the house of Lady Zahra (s)] and if they resist they should be fought. Umar set out for the house of Fatima carrying a burning torch. When Fatima (s) saw this, she cried: O son of Khattab, have you brought fire to burn down my place? He replied: Yes, if you don't enter that in which the Ummah has entered (allegiance of Abu Bakr)...[46]

11. Report of Ibne Abde Barr Qurtubi (463 A.H.)

Ibne Abde Barr Qurtubi says:

> Fatima said: Umar came and swore that if you again hold a meeting here, he would do this and that; and by Allah, he would indeed do what he has sworn.[47]

12. Report of Muqatil bin Atiyyah (505 A.H.)

It is mentioned in the report of Muqatil bin Atiyyah:

> When Abu Bakr took allegiance of the people through threats, sword and force, Umar sent Qunfadh and some people to the house of Ali (a) and Fatima (s) and Umar gathered firewood and burnt up the door of the house...[48]

13. Report of Imamul Harmain Juwaini (730 A.H.) about the reliability of the report

Juwaini, about whose personality and lofty rank among Ahle Sunnat scholars and the reliability and value of his reports in their view we mentioned above[49], says that the Messenger of Allah (s) remarked:

> When I see Fatima (s) I am reminded of the tragedies that are to befall her after my passing away. As if I can see with my own eyes, that disrespect has entered her house, her sanctity is destroyed, her right has been usurped, she is deprived of her inheritance, her side is broken and her unborn son is killed in the womb, she wails: O Muhammada, but no one comes for her rescue...Fatima would be my first family member to join me after being aggrieved and oppressed and after being martyred.[50]

Report of Juwaini proves that the house of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) became the target of attack, her sanctity was trespassed, her rights were usurped and her side was broken and so on...

Juwaini blamed for being 'Hatib Lail'[51]

Some Wahabis have accused Juwaini to be 'Hatib Lail' and due to this they have considered his reports, valueless.

'Hatib Lail' means one who gathers firewood during the night and in the terminology of science of narrators (*Ilme Rijal*), it implies one who mixes up genuine and weak traditional reports.

The simple meaning of 'Hatib Lail' is one who narrates a report without chains of narrators.[52]

The only support and proof of Wahabism for their accusation is the claim of Ibne Hajar Asqalani in attribution of such accusation to Shamsuddin Dhahabi.

> Even though Ibne Hajar has attributed this matter to Dhahabi, but a study of Dhahabi's books, like: Seer Aalamun Nubla, Tarikhul Islam, Mizanul Etedal, Tadkiratul Huffaz, Tanqihut Tahqir, Al-Kashif fee Marifa man lahu Rawayat fee Kutub al-Sitta, Al-Mukhtasar min Tarikh Ibne Dabithi, Mojamul Shuyukh, Mojamul Mukhtas, Al-Mughni fil Zoafa etc...shows that this statement is not found in them; on the basis of this, the actual existence of this statement of Dhahabi for Juwaini is doubtful.

In addition to this, since Juwaini was a teacher of Dhahabi, such a thing is not compatible to the fact that he praised and extolled his teacher much in his different books.[53] Is it possible for Dhahabi to issue such a critical statement?

Besides, even if we suppose that Dhahabi has mentioned such a thing about his teacher, even then it is not possible to ignore his reports on this pretext, because many senior Ahle Sunnat scholars about whose integrity and reliability there is no doubt, had also been 'Hatib Lail' in view of their scholars; like Jalaluddin Suyuti,[54] Abu Ishaq Thalabi, (author of *Tafsir Thalabi*)[55], Ibne Jauzi[56], Ibne Taymiyyah[57], Zamakhshari and Ghazzali.[58]

14. Statement of Ibne Taymiyyah, founder of Wahabism (728 A.H.)

Even Ibne Taymiyyah Harrani, leader of Wahabism, has hinted about the incident of attack on the house of revelation and he says in *Minhajus Sunnah*:

> Umar bin Khattab surrounded the house of Fatima to see if anything from the Public Treasury was kept there; that he may distribute it among deserving people.[59]

The fact is that the incident of attack of house of Lady Fatima (s) in the view of Ibne Taymiyyah was a proven thing and which cannot be denied, even though he tried to justify it and give it an unacceptable form, which is not concealed from any sane person, but even he cannot deny its factuality.

15. Report of Abul Fida (732 A.H.)

Abul Fida has written in his *Tarikh*:

> Abu Bakr sent Umar to Ali and his companions to bring them out from the house of Fatima and he (Abu Bakr) said: If they resist, confront them. Umar came with some fire to burn the house. Fatima saw him and asked: O son of Khattab, where are you hastening to in this way? Have you come to burn down my house? Umar said: Yes, except if you do that which people have done.[60]

16. Report of Safdi (764 A.H.)

Safdi has mentioned in his book:

> On the day of allegiance, Umar hit on the belly of Fatima and caused the miscarriage of Mohsin.[61]

17. Report of Abu Walid Muhammad bin Shahna Hanafi (817 A.H.)

Abu Walid Muhammad bin Shahna has narrated as follows:

> Umar came to the house of Ali (a) to burn him with those who were in his company. Fatima (s) confronted Umar. Umar said to Fatima: Enter that into which the Ummah has entered (allegiance of Abu Bakr)...[62]

18. Report of Shamsuddin Dhahabi (748 A.H.) and Ibne Hajar Asqalani (852 A.H.)

Ibne Hajar Asqalani in *Lisanul Mizan* and Dhahabi in *Mizanul Etedal* have written that:

> Umar hit on the belly of Fatima and caused the miscarriage of Mohsin.[63]

But Ibne Hajar has rejected this report, because of the presence of Ibne Abi Daram in its chain of narrators on the pretext that he is *Rafidi* (Shia); whereas Dhahabi instead in his book of *Seer Aalamun Nubla* has called him Imam, Hafiz and learned...[64] And in another place, he said regarding him:

> Among his qualities was that he was a memorizer of traditional reports and was cognizant of traditions and the only defect he had was that he had Shii beliefs.[65]

And in another place he says:

> Muhammad bin Hammad Hafiz has said regarding him: He was a person having correct beliefs throughout his life.[66]

In the same way, Dhahabi has mentioned in *Mizanul Etedal*:

> He, throughout his life had correct and firm beliefs.[67]

Later on Dhahabi condemns him for being a *Rafidi* (Shia) and for narrating this report and some other reports in condemnation of Caliphs and called him names, like: old man, deviated and licentious person[68], but can being a Shia lead to loss of integrity in a person to narrate a tradition? What logic and reasoning permits us to leave aside the reports of a person and to declare them as invalid only because of the fact that he is a Shia?

If Shiaism is a criterion for acceptance or rejection of traditions, Ahle Sunnat should draw a line of invalidity on a large number of traditional reports in their six canonical books (*Sihah Sitta*), because the authors of *Sihah Sitta* have often narrated traditions from Shia (*Rafidi* according to them). Some of their names are mentioned in the footnote.[69]

How is it possible to believe that a person earned the titles of Imam, Hafiz and learned; and all his life he remains steadfast on faith, has strong memory and cognition of religious concepts, and his reports are of the rank that all scholars have consensus on them, but at the same time he is also called deviated and sinner? Can terms and qualities like Imam, Hafiz, learned and cognitive be mentioned together with words like: old man, deviated and licentious person?

Yes, it is because of bigotry beyond limits, an illogical defense of the school of Caliphs and effort to defend their honor that a great personality like Dhahabi is compelled to make these hypocritical statements in his book.

It is possible that they might reply that only being a *Rafidi* (Shia) is not the reason for the reporter to be condemned, on the contrary, it is being an extremist in being a *Rafidi*.[70]

In that case, we again say: On investigating the six canonical books of Ahle Sunnat, it is concluded that in chains of reporters of a large number of reports, there are people who according to the admission of Ahle Sunnat scholars have extremism in *Rafdh*, but in spite of this the authors of *Sihah Sitta* have narrated from them. For example:

1. Adi bin Thabit: Whereas Ibne Hajar Asqalani has said regarding him:

> Ibne Moin has said that he is an extremist Shia. Salmi has said: I asked Darqutni regarding him. He replied: He is a reliable person, but the only problem with him is that he has observed extremism in his Shiaism.[71]

In the same way, there are other persons as well, whose names would be mentioned to maintain brevity, like: 2. Ibad bin Yaqub Rawajani. 3. Ismail bin Khalifah and so on...

If extremism in *Rafdh* (being a harsh Shia) by your own definition is talking ill of a Caliph acceptable to Ahle Sunnat and it becomes the cause of declaring the reporter as weak, why senior Ahle Sunnat scholars have narrated from them in their most authentic books?

In the same way, it is possible that they might object: Since Ibne Abi Daram in the last days of his life has mentioned the defects of Abu Bakr and Umar and has cursed them, his reports are rejected and not acceptable.

Here also, we would reply: Following are some reporters who are present in the chain of reporters of *Sihah Sitta* of Ahle Sunnat, who in spite of the fact that they curse those two caliphs, are considered honest and their reports are accepted as *Sahih* (authentic) reports, for example:

1. Abu Sulaiman, Talid bin Sulaiman Muahribi[72] 2. Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam[73].

Although it is obvious that generally with regard to such persons, the attitude of Ahle Sunnat is that if the reports are in their favor they accept them and consider them credible (*Hasan*); like the traditional reports of Talid bin Sulaiman, which he has narrated in the excellence of first and second Ahle Sunnat Caliph, but reports which are opposed to Ahle Sunnat or against Abu Bakr and Umar, are considered weak due to his being a *Rafidi*.

More regretful than that which is mentioned so far, is the fact that Ahle Sunnat scholars of science of narrators have appreciated those who have abused Amirul Momineen, Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a).

Now, we ask: If cursing and abusing the companions of the Holy Prophet (s) is cause of weakening of the reporter, why *Nasibis* – enemies of Amirul Momineen (a) have been praised?

Should one who abuses Abu Bakr and Umar be considered weak, but one who abuses Amirul Momineen (a) is regarded as trustworthy? Is this hypocritical stance justifiable?

By way of example we mention the names of some *Nasibi* – enemies of Amirul Momineen Ali (a) who have been praised by Ahle Sunnat scholars of science of narrators:

1 – Huraiz bin Uthman Himsi:

This person used to curse and abuse Amirul Momineen (a) seventy times every morning and evening. This matter is mentioned by three most senior Ahle Sunnat scholars of science of narrators.[74]

The astonishing fact is that this is a person about whom most praises have been recorded.[75]

If cursing and abusing Ahle Sunnat Caliphs becomes the cause of weakening of the reporter, why Bukhari has narrated from him? Why Ahmad bin Hanbal has praised him in such words?

2 – Umar bin Saad bin Abi Waqqas, killer of Imam Husain (a)[76]:

How is it possible that one who martyred the sons of the Messenger of Allah (s) in such a terrible manner and in such tragical circumstances, and grieved the daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s), be considered so reliable by Ahle Sunnat scholars in narrating traditions and be accepted as decisive proof by them? But one who is much devoted to Amirul Momineen Ali (a) and who considers His Eminence superior to the three Caliphs, or sometimes he insults one of the three Caliphs, how his reports are weak and unacceptable?

All the statement mentioned above lead to the conclusion that traditional reports of Ibne Abi Daram do not have any objection and accusations like his being *Rafidi* or extremist

Shia do not undermine the authenticity of his reports, because the same points are true for narrators of Bukhari, Muslim and other Sihah books of Ahle Sunnat.

19. Panegyric (Qasida) of Muhammad Hafiz Ibrahim (1287 – 1351 A.H.)

The Egyptian poet, Muhammad Hafiz Ibrahim, who is famous as the poet of the Nile, has a *Diwan*[77] to his credit, which is published in ten volumes. In his *Qasida*, famous as 'Qasida Umariya' he has considered it to be a matter of pride for Umar to come to Ali's house and say: If you don't come out and give allegiance to Abu Bakr, I will burn down the house even if the daughter of the Prophet is inside it.

It is noteworthy that he recited this Qasida on important occasions and the audience not only did not find fault in him, on the contrary, they encouraged him and gifted him medals of pride.

In this Qasida, he says:

> And the words spoken by Umar to Ali (a) were: Strange was the respected hearer and what an important speaker?! Umar said to Ali (a): If you don't give allegiance your house will be burnt down and I will not leave anyone alive in it; even if the daughter of the Prophet is there in it. Except for Abu Hafas (Umar) no one could dare to make this statement before the stalwart of Adnan and his defender.[78]

20. Statement of Umar Reza Kahala (modern scholar)

Umar Reza Kahala is among the famous Arab contemporary Ahle Sunnat scholars, writers, researchers and biographers (died 1408 A.H.). He writes in his *Elamun Nisa* quoting authorities that:

> Abu Bakr sent Umar in pursuit of some who had refused to pay allegiance to him – like Abbas, Zubair and Saad bin Ubadah – who had taken refuge in the house of Fatima with Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a); Umar came and told them to come out. They were in the house and they refused to come out. Umar asked for firewood and said: By Allah, in whose hands is my life, if you don't come out to give allegiance, I will burn it down along with its occupants. He was told: O Aba Hafas (agnomen of Umar), Fatima is present in this house. He replied: Even if Fatima is present there (I will burn it down).[79]

21. STATEMENT OF ABDUL FATAH ABDUL MAQSOOD (MODERN SCHOLAR)

Abdul Fatah Abdul Maqsood (born 1912 A.D. in Alexandria, Egypt) was an intellectual of the Sunni faith and a prominent Egyptian writer who has composed eloquent and expressive Arabic verses in excess and is the author of a large number of books like, *Abna Ana Maa ar Rasul, Yaum Kiyum Uthman, Saleebiya Ilal Abad, Az-Zahra Umme Abiha, Al Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib, As-Saqifah wal Khilafah* and so on...

His greatest and most important book is *Al-Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib* in nine volumes, which he wrote in a period of thirty years, which by insight and close examination has opened new doors of research in the analytic history of Islam and has removed many doubts.

This well informed and well known Egyptian intellectual has mentioned the incident of attack on the house of revelation in two places in his book:

> Umar said: By God in whose hands is the life of Umar, if you do not come out of the house I would burn it down along with its occupants. Some religious persons and who respected the sanctity of the Holy Prophet (s)

and his descendants, said: O Aba Hafas, Fatima is present in this house, but he replied without concern: Let her be! Umar came forward and knocked at the door, then he hit it with his fists and kicked it till he entered it forcibly...scream of lady Zahra arose from the house...that wail was a resonation for call of help, which the daughter of the Prophet called out and she said: Father, O the Messenger of Allah (s)...Fatima, through her wails, wanted to inform her father who had passed away about the oppression of one of his companions. Perhaps the disobedience of the stretched neck of carelessness of these companions would be exposed, that its forcibility would be gone, and the severity of the act and tough stance would be destroyed. She hoped that a lightning would engulf him immediately. When the people returned and Umar wanted to flee from the scream of Lady Zahra (s) like a desert deer, Ali (a) due to the severity of emotions clasped the handle of the sword as if his anger was swallowed by it.[80]

He further writes in the same book:

But is the mouth of people closed and their tongues have became dumb that they do not question incident in which Umar ordered that firewood should be gathered at the door of the house of Fatima (s)? Yes, the son of Khattab surrounded the house of Fatima in which Ali and his friends were present to either convince them or attack without any regard. All this was either pre-planned or it happened suddenly. Like foam, it appeared on the surface of the waves and not much time passed that Umar went away from there!... That person set out from the house of Ali (a) in anger and fury. His companions also followed him and

attacked the house. Suddenly the face of the Messenger of Allah (s) became visible between the door of the house – a face, which was covered in a veil of sorrow and signs of grief were visible in it. Tears were flowing from the eyes and his face was angry...Umar was shocked and the fury that he had shown went away. His companions who had followed him stood before the house in bewilderment; because the face of the Messenger of Allah (s) was visible in the face of his beloved daughter Lady Zahra (s). Heads were bowed due to shame and eyes were lowered. The hearts became uncontrollable. While they looked at Fatima, who started moving like a shadow and with trembling steps, she moved to the tomb of her father with sorrow and grief...People focused their eyes and ears upon her. Her wail arose and tears fell down like raindrops and she again and again called her father with a burning heart: "Father, O Messenger of Allah (s)..." As if the earth was shaking below the feet of these oppressive fellows due to the call of Fatima...Lady Zahra (s) moved closer and facing that purified grave and said: "Father, O Messenger of Allah (s)...after you what all we had to suffer at the hands of the sons of Khattab and Abu Qahafa." No heart remained, but that it trembled and no eye remained without shedding tears. Those people wished the earth swallows them.[81]

22. Statements of Hasan bin Farhan Maliki (Modern Scholar)

Dr. Hasan bin Farhan Maliki, teacher and researcher of education, training, development and practice, has written in this regard:

Supporters of Ali (a), during allegiance to Umar were less than those who supported him (Ali) during

allegiance of Abu Bakr; as in the beginning of Abu Bakr's Caliphate they had besieged the house of Fatima as some companions were against paying allegiance to Abu Bakr. This claim is proved through correct authorities.[82]

Then he writes in its margin:

In the beginning I was of the view that the story of attack was false and incorrect, but after referring and research I found confirmed referential authorities of the same and one of those references is the statement of Ibne Abi Shaybah in *Al-Musannaf*; after that this tragic incident is proved through correct references.[83]

NOTES

[1] Very important points regarding the fact that in case the chain of narrators is narrated through three, although weak chains, in view of Shia and Sunni science of narrator there is no need of investigation as mentioned in this book in point no. 9. under the chain of narrators of Tibrani, objection against the report of Tibrani.

[2] We shall mention this report in more detail in the coming pages, and the aim of this part of report will become clear.

[3] *Al-Amwaal*, Pg. 144, Abu Ubaid Qasim bin Salam (d. 224 A.H.), Footnote no. 4, Nashr Kulliyat Azhariya – wal Amwal, Vol. 1, Pg. 387, Abu Ahmad Hamid bin Mukhallad bin Qutaibah bin Abdullah, alias Ibne Zanjuya Khorasani (d. 251 A.H.);

Al-Mojam Kabir, Vol. 1, Pg. 62, Sulaiman bin Ahmad bin Ayyub Abul Qasim Tibrani (d. 360 A.H.), Maktaba Zahra, Mosul, 1404 A.H. – 1983 A.D. Second edition, Edited: Hamdi bin Abdul Majeed Salafi;

Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 353, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari, (d. 310), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut;

Tarikh Medina Damishq wa Zikr Fadhlaha wa Tasmiya man Halha minal Amail, Vol. 30, Pg. 418, Abul Qasim Ali bin Hasan Ibne Hibtullah bin Abdullah Shafei (d. 571 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1995, Edited: Mohibbuddin Abi Saeed Umar bin Ghurama Umari:

Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 3, Pg. 118, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri;

Majamuz Zawaid wa Manbaul Fawaid, Vol. 5, Pg. 202, Ali bin Abu Bakr Haithami (d. 807 A.H.), Darul Riyan Lilturath/Dar Kitab al-Arabi – Cairo, - Beirut – 1407;

Al-Imamah was Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 21, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari (d. 276 A.H.), Edited: Khalil al-Mansur, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1418 A.H. – 1997 A.D. Edited: Shiri, Vol. 1, Pg. 36, and Edited: Zaini, Vol. 1, Pg. 24;

Al-Iqdul Farid, Vol. 4, Pg. 254; Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Abde Rabb al-Andulasi (d. 328 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, Second edition, 1420 A.H. – 1999 A.D.;

Murujuz Zahab, Vol. 1, Pg. 290, Abul Hasan Ali bin Husain bin Ali al-Masudi (d. 346 A.H.);

Simtul Nujum al-Awali fee Anbail Awail wat Tawali, Vol. 2, Pg. 465, Abdul Malik bin Husain Abdul Malik Shafei Asimi Makki (d. 1111 A.H.), Edited: Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud – Ali Muhammad Maudh, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1419 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

You will read more points regarding this report and other sources, which we have quoted under Reference no. 9, Report of Tibrani (d. 310 A.H.).

[4] Nazzam was not an ordinary person in the view of Ahle Sunnat: on the contrary, he was praised in many ways, some of which are mentioned below:

Khatib Baghdadi, a senior Ahle Sunnat scholar, says regarding him:

Ibrahim bin Sayyar Abu Ishaq al-Nazzam was of those who came and settled down in Baghdad. He was reformer and theorist of scholastic theology (according to Mutazali view) has written numerous books. He was a literary person and has composed a large number of profound and meaningful couplets regarding theology. Abu Uthman Jahiz (his student) has quoted extensively from him.

Tarikh Baghdad, Vol. 6, Pg. 97, No. 3131, Ahmad bin Ali Abu Bakr al-Khatib Baghdadi (d. 463 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut.

Ibne Makula has said about him as follows:

Nazzam implies Ibrahim bin Sayyar Abu Ishaq Nazzam...He was reformer and theorist of scholastic theology. He was also a literary personality having composed a large number of beautiful and eloquent couplets.

Al-Ikmal fee Rafal Irtiyab Anil Mutalif wa Mutakhaliif fil Asmaa wal Kun, Vol. 7, Pg. 274, Ali bin Hibatullah bin Abi Nasr Ibne Makula (d. 475 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition 1411 A.H.

[5] *Al-Wafi bil Wafiyat*, Vol. 6, Pg. 17, No. 2444 – *Al-Milal wan Nihal*, Shahristani, Vol. 1, Pg. 57, Darul Marifa, Beirut.

[6] The most important objections leveled against Nazzam are due to the following reports:

1- Clarification of the Imamate of Amirul Momineen (a) by the Messenger of Allah (s).

Nazzam believed that Imamate was fixed after the passing away of

the Holy Prophet (s) and he said: The Messenger of Allah (s) declared Amirul Momineen (a) as the Imam after him, but Umar denied it.

Reply:

This statement is not only related to Nazzam, the Mutazali; on the contrary, some other senior Ahle Sunnat scholars, like Ghazzali have also clarified it and he says:

...among the sermons of the Holy Prophet of Islam (s) is the sermon of His Eminence, according to the consensus of all Muslims, the sermon on Eid Ghadeer, in which he said: Of whomsoever I am the master, Ali is also his master. Umar bin Khattab after this command of the Messenger of Allah (s) congratulated Ali (a) in the following manner: O Abul Hasan, congratulations, congratulations, today you have become my master and master of all. This statement of Umar is his acknowledgment of the command of the Prophet and Imamate and leadership of Ali (a) and a sign of his acceptance of the selection of Ali (a) for the leadership of the Ummah, but after a passage of time, Umar was beset with selfish desires and inclination for his own rulership and leadership, and the institution of Caliphate was changed from its original position and through military expeditions and attacks and by expansion of the territories of Islam, he led the Ummah to controversies and a turning back to the period of Ignorance, [and he became implication of this verse of Quran:]

"...but they cast it behind their backs and took a small price for it, so evil is that which they buy." (Surah Aale Imran 3:187)

And when the Messenger of Allah (s) passed away, he said before his demise: Bring paper and inkpot, so that I may solve the problem of Caliphate after me and introduce to you the one, who is eligible for it. Umar said: Don't pay attention to this man, he is talking nonsense.

Sirrul Aalameen wa Kashfe Maa fid Darain, Vol. 1, Pg. 18, Chapter of Sequence of Caliphate and rulership, Abu Hamid Muhammad bin Muhammad Ghazzali (d. 505 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Hasan Ismail and Ahmad Farid Mazidi. Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, Lebanon, First edition, 1424 A.H. and 2003 A.D.

Our question to Ahle Sunnat scholars is: Would you deem Ghazzali unreliable because of this statement?

2- Umar's doubting the prophethood of the Messenger of Allah (s)

The second objection made against Nazzam is that he believed that Umar bin Khattab in the Treaty of Hudaibiyah, had doubted in the prophethood of the Messenger of Allah (s):

Reply:

Umar's objections to the Holy Prophet (s) during the treaty of Hudaibiyah is a story, which is also mentioned in *Sahih Bukhari* and *Muslim*:

Narrated Abu Wail: We were in Siffeen and Sahl bin Hunaif got up and said, "O people! Blame yourselves! We were with the Prophet on the day of Hudaibiyah, and if we had been called to fight, we would have fought, but Umar bin Khattab came and said, 'O Allah's Apostle! Aren't we in the right and our opponents in the wrongs' Allah's Apostle said, 'Yes.' Umar said, 'Aren't our killed persons in Paradise and their's in Hell?' He said, 'Yes.' Umar said, 'Then why should we accept hard terms in matters concerning our religion? Shall we return before Allah judges between us and them?' Allah's Apostle said, 'O Ibne Al-Khattab! I am the Apostle of Allah and Allah will never degrade me.

Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari), Vol. 2, Pg. 1162, Tr. no. 3011, Kitabul Jihad was Sayr, Chapter of the sin of one who makes a vow and then violates it, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

Doubt of Umar in the prophethood of the Holy Prophet (s) is among the universally accepted facts among Ahle Sunnat and Ahmad bin Hanbal, Abdur Razzaq Sanani, Shamsuddin Dhahabi, Ibne Hibban etc. has mentioned this story in detail and even clarified that Umar bin Khattab, due to his doubt and audacity to the Holy Prophet (s) used to give alms and perform good acts by way of penalty for his act. For example refer to the commentaries of Tabari and Suyuti under the commentary of verse 60:1 and Thalabi, Thaalabi Baghwi, and Baghdadi under the commentary of the verse 48:25 has presented this matter in the following manner:

Umar said: By Allah, I never doubted from the time I accepted till the day I came to the Prophet and said: Are you not the Messenger of Allah (s)? I said: Are we not on the right and our enemies not in the wrong? He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Then why should we accept hard terms in matters concerning our religion?

Al-Kashf wal Bayan (*Tafsir Thalabi*), Vol. 9. Pg. 60, Abu Ishaq Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ibrahim Thalabi Nishapuri (d. 427 A.H.) – 1035 A.D., Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, 1422 A.H. – 2002 A.D. First edition, Edited: Al-Imam Abu Muhammad bin Ashur, Reference and research: Ustad Nazir Saadi.

Jamiul Bayan An Taweel Ayyul Quran (*Tafsir Tabari*), Vol. 28, Pg. 61, Muhammad bin Jarir bin Yazid bin Khalid Tabari, Abu Ja'far (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1405

Tafsir Baghawi, Vol. 4, Pg. 202, Al-Baghawi (d. 516), Darul Marifa, Beirut, Edited: Khalid bin Abdur Rahman al-Ak.

Tafsir Khazin (Lubabut Taweel fee Maani at-Tanzeel) Vol. 6, Pg. 208, Alauddin Ali bin Muhammad bin Ibrahim Baghdadi, famous as Al-Khazin (d. 725 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, Lebanon, 1399 A.H. – 1979 A.D. Unedited.

Al-Jawahirul Ahsan fee Tafseerul Quran (Tafsir Thaalabi), Vol. 9, Pg. 60, Abdur Rahman bin Muhammad bin Makhluf Thaalabi (d. 875), Mausasal Aalami Lil Matbuat, Beirut.

Ad-Durrul Manthur, Vol. 8, Pg. 129, Abdur Rahman bin Kamaal Jalaluddin Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut – 1993.

On the basis of this, this matter does not exclusively pertain to Nazzam, on the contrary, numerous senior Ahle Sunnat scholars have also narrated such things.

Now, with attention to this point, would you declare persons Bukhari, Muslim, Dhahabi, Ibne Hibban, Abdur Razzaq Sanaani, Tibrani and Suyuti...as weak because of this matter?

3- Tarawih Prayer – an innovation of Umar

The third objection leveled against Nazzam was that he considered Tarawih Prayer as an innovation of Umar!

Reply:

Narrating of this matter is not exclusive to Nazzam; on the contrary, this is among the facts of history; so much so, even Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari, in the most authoritative book of Ahle Sunnat, has narrated it. Bukhari writes:

Abdur Rahman bin Abdul Qari said, "I went out in the company of Umar bin Al-Khattab one night in Ramadan to the mosque and found the people praying in different groups. A man praying alone or a man praying with a little group behind him. So, Umar said, 'In

my opinion I better collect these (people) under the leadership of one *Qari* (Reciter) (i.e. let them pray in congregation!)'. So, he made up his mind to congregate them behind Ubayy bin Kaab. Then on another night I went again in his company and the people were praying behind their reciter. On that, Umar remarked, 'What an excellent Bidat (i.e. innovation in religion) this is.

Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari), Vol. 2, Pg. 707, Tr. no. 1906, Kitab Salatul Tarawih, Chapter of excellence of those who pray in Ramadhan, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.). Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

Can Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari be considered weak, because he has narrated this report and can his book be declared unreliable?

4- Prohibition of Mutah of Hajj by Umar

The fourth objection against Nazzam is that he believed that Umar bin Khattab went against the practice of the Holy Prophet (s) and prohibited Mutah of Hajj.

Reply:

This matter is also a universally accepted historical fact and it is not only Nazzam who has narrated it: on the contrary, many senior Ahle Sunnat scholars, including Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari and Muslim Nishapuri have clarified this matter in their respective *Sahih*.

Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari has mentioned in his *Sahih*: Narrated Imran: The verse of Mutah was revealed during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah (s) and we performed Hajj-at-Tamattu in the lifetime of Allah's Apostle and no verse was revealed prohibiting it and the Messenger of Allah (s) also did not forbid it as long as he lived and somebody said what he wished according his own opinion. Muhammad (Bukhari) said: This person was Umar bin Khattab.

Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari), Vol. 4, Pg. 133, Tr. no. 4246, Kitabut Tafsir, Baab Faman Tamatta-a bil Umrah Ilal Hajj, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.). Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

And Muhammad bin Muslim Nishapuri writes:

Abu Nadra reported: While I was in the company of Jabir bin Abdullah, a person came to him and said that Ibne Abbas and Ibne Zubair differed on the two types of Mutas (Tamattu of Hajj and Tamattu with women), whereupon Jabir said: We used to do these two during the lifetime of Allah's Messenger (peace be on him). Umar then forbade us to do them, and so we did not revert to them.

Sahih Muslim, Vol. 2, Pg. 914, Tr. no. 1249, Kitabul Hajj, Baab Taqsir Fil Umrah, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

And Sarakhsi, the famous Hanafite jurist has clarified in *Al-Mabsut,* and he writes:

It is narrated from Umar in a correct report that he prohibited temporary marriage and said: Two Mutahs were lawful during the lifetime of the Prophet and the people acted on them; but I prohibit them: one is the Mutah of Hajj and the other is the Mutah marriage.

Al-Mabsut, Vol. 4, Pg. 27, Shamsuddin Sarakhsi (d. 483 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut.

On the basis of this, objections of some Ahle Sunnat scholars, like Shahristani and Safdi are not applicable to him and his special beliefs will not lead to him being considered as weak, because many Ahle Sunnat senior scholars also have the same beliefs.

[7] *Al-Musannaf fil Ahadith wal Aathaar*, Vol. 7, Pg. 432, Abu Bakr bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abi Shaybah al-Kufi (d. 235), Maktabe Rushd, Riyadh – 1409 A.H., First edition, Edited: Kamaal Yusuf Alhut.

[8] www.fnoor.com

[9] Ibne Hajar, *Taqribut Tahdhib*, no. 2117; Shaykh Albani, *Mojam Asami*, Vol. 2, Pg. 73. www.fnoor.com

[10] 1. Investigation of the report of Ibne Abi Shaybah:

1- Muhammad bin Bishar:

Ibne Hajar has written in *Tahdhibut Tahdhib*:

He is a trustworthy person and a large number of traditions are narrated from him. Nasai and Ibne Qane have considered him reliable. Ibne Shahin has included his name in the list of trustworthy reporters.

Tahdhibut Tahdhib, Vol. 9, Pg. 90, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1404 – 1984, First edition.

2. Ubaidullah Ibne Umar bin Hafas bin Asim bin Umar bin Khattab:

Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* has written about him:

Abu Hatim said: I asked Ahmad bin Hanbal about Malik, Ubaidullah Ibne Umar and Ayyub as to which of them is more trustworthy in narrating traditions? He replied: Ubaidullah is more reliable from the aspect of memory and accuracy and narrating traditions and regarding the number of traditional reports. Son of Ahmad bin Hanbal has also quoted from Yahya bin Moin: He is from the reliable narrators. Abu Bakr bin Manjuya said: He is from the leaders and elders of Medina and Quraish having excellence, knowledge, nobility, worship, memorization of traditions and certitude.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 19, Pg. 127

3- Zaid bin Aslam Qarshi Adawi:

He is among the reporters of traditions of *Sahih Bukhari*, *Muslim* and other *Sihah Sitta* of Ahle Sunnat; due to this the reliability of this person is unquestionable in the view of Ahle Sunnat.

Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* has written about him:

Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal has narrated from his father, Abu Zara, Abu Hatim, Muhammad bin Saad, Nasai and Ibne Kharash have narrated that he is a trustworthy person. And Yaqub bin Shaybah has said: He is a trustworthy person, a jurist, a learned man; he is a scholar of Quranic exegesis and has written a book on this topic.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 10, Pg. 17

4- Aslam al-Qarshi Adawi, Abu Khalid, known as Abu Zaid Madani, freed slave of Umar bin Khattab:

He is also among the reporters of Bukhari, Muslim and other authentic books of Ahle Sunnat tradition and he is from the companions and since according to Ahle Sunnat all companions were having integrity, his veracity can also be not doubted.

Mizzi has written in *Tahdhibul Kamaal*:

He lived during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (s). Ajal has said about him: He is from the natives of Medina; he is reliable and a senior companion of companions. Abu Zaraa has considered him reliable.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 2, Pg. 530

Consequently the chain of narrators of this report is perfectly genuine.

[11] Details of this matter will follow soon under reference no. 22.

[12] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 2, Pg. 1007, Tr. 1386, Kitabul Hajj, Chapter 89; Chapter of "Allah will punish those who intend to do any harm to the citizens of Medina," Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Has Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut, Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi.

[13] *Tarikhul Islam wa Wafayatul Mashahir wal Aaalaam*, Vol. 5, Pg. 26, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri

[14] *Al-Muhalli*, Vol. 9, Pg. 345, Ali bin Ahmad bin Saeed bin Hazm Zahiri, Abu Muhammad (d. 456), Darul Afaqul Jadida, Beirut – Edited: Lajna Ahya Turathul Arabi.

[15] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Balazari, Vol. 1, Pg. 586

[16] Investigation into the chain of reporters of traditional report:

Balazari has narrated the traditional report through this chain of reporters:

Madaini from Muslimah bin Maharib from Sulaiman Teemi from Ibne Aun: Indeed Abu Bakr...

1- Madaini:

Dhahabi has said about Madaini that:

Madaini: Allamah Hafiz Sadiq Abul Hasan Ali bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Abi Saif Madaini Akhbari: He was a history scholar and was learned about battles, expeditions and poems, and regarding these matters he is included among the accurate reporters.

In continuation of the statement of Yahya bin Moin, he writes:

Yahya bin Moin has said regarding him thrice: He is reliable. He is reliable. He is reliable.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 10, Pg. 401, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin

Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 16, Pg. 290, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition. Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri.

2- Muslimah bin Maharib:

Ibne Hibban has described him in Kitabus Thiqat; therefore doubt of anonymity of this person is invalid.

Ath-Thiqat: Ibne Hibban, Vol. 7, Pg. 490

3- Sulaiman Teemi:

Mizzi has said in *Tahdhibul Kamaal*:

Rabi bin Yahya has narrated from Shoba bin Hajjaj that he said: I have not seen anyone more truthful than Sulaiman. Whenever he narrated traditions from the Holy Prophet (s), his expression used to change.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 12, Pg. 8, Biography of Sulaiman bin Tarqan Teemi, Abu Motamar Basri, no. 2531 – *Al-Jirha wa Tadeel*, Vol. 4, Pg. 124, Biography Sulaiman Teemi, no. 539.

4- Abdullah bin Aun:

Some have objected that the report is *Maqtu* (cut off) over here as he has not narrated the report from companions whereas Safdi, an important Ahle Sunnat scholar has said regarding Ibne Aun:

Possibility exists for him that he heard reports from a group of companions.

Al-Wafi bil Wafiyat, Vol. 17, Pg. 390, under the biography of Hafiz Mazni Abdullah bin Aun bin Artaban Abu Aun al-Mazni, no. 320.

This is when reports exists mentioning the companionship of this person, as Ibne Saad has narrated in *Tabaqatul Kubra*:

Ibne Aun was very eager to meet the Holy Prophet (s) [at last he got this chance and] a shortly before the passing away of the Prophet, he was able to see him and was extremely elated for this...

Tabaqatul Kubra, Vol. 7, Pg. 198, under the biography of Abdullah bin Aun bin Artaban, No. 3232, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, (Beirut, Lebanon).

So much so that if we suppose that Ibne Aun was not a companion and that he was a companion of companions (*Tabii*), even then no harm comes to this report; as the father of science of narrators (*Ilme Rijal*) of Ahle Sunnat, Shoba bin Hajjaj says regarding him:

My doubt about Ibne Aun is better and more acceptable than the certainty of others.

Preface to *Al-Jirha wa Tadeel*, Pg. 145

And Ibne Mubarak says:

I have not seen anyone superior to Ibne Aun and Shoba has said: My doubt about Ibne Aun is better and more acceptable than the certainty of others.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 6, Pg. 365, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413 A.H., Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

Mizzi has also written in *Tahdhibul Kamaal*:

Umar bin Habib says: I heard Uthman Batti say: My eyes have not seen anyone like Aun (in excellence and superiority).

And many more other praises are mentioned about him, but we refrain to quote them here:

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 15, Pg. 399, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.). Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

Consequently, as we stated:

Firstly: Some Ahle Sunnat scholars have clarified that he was a companion and he met the Messenger of Allah (s) in his last days; he was present during the incident of attack on the house of Fatima (s) and was aware of the issue.

Secondly: Supposing that the report is disconnected and it is mentioned by Ibne Aun of his own accord: in that case also it is sufficient to prove our claim, because a person like Ibne Aun, doubt in whom is same as certainty among Ahle Sunnat scholars...is sufficient for us and is sufficient to prove genuineness of the report.

[17] *Al-Imamah was Siyasah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 30, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari (d. 276 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Taha Zaini, Mausisatal Halabi wa Shoraka Lil

Nashr wat Tauzih and Vol. 1, Pg. 16, Edited: Khalil Mansur, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1418 A.H. and 1997 A.D.; Edited: Shiri, Vol. 1, Pg. 30; and Edited: Zaini, Vol. 1, Pg. 19.

[18] *Kutub wa Rasail wa Fatawa Ibne Taymiyyah*, Vol. 17, Pg. 391, Ahmad Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Harrani, Abul Abbas (d. 728), Maktaba Ibne Taymiyyah, Second edition, Edited: Abdur Rahman bin Muhammad bin Qasim Asmi Najdi.

[19] Dozy is one of the orientalists and following him some Wahabis of today claim that the book of *Imamah was Siyasah* is neither ancient nor authentic, because it contains historical doubts and imaginative and inappropriate reports, so the attribution of this work to Ibne Qutaibah is not acceptable. [www.valiasr-aj.com]

[20] For example some Wahabi websites have mentioned the following objections in brief:

Some points, which prove that the attribution of this book to Ibne Qutaibah is wrong: 1. Biographies of authors: They don't mention this book among the writings of Ibne Qutaibah. 2. Those who consider this book to be a work of Ibne Qutaibah, have said: The writer of this book was in Damascus and he never left Baghdad, and except for Dinawar, he did not travel anywhere. 3. This book is narrated from a person named Abi Laila as it was not possible to narrate from him. 4. The writer has mentioned some improbable incidents in the topic of conquest of Spain. 5. These same points are true in case of the conquest of Marakkesh. 6. Matters mentioned in this book are filled with foolishness, simplicity, evil, falsehood and deceit; such things are least expected from ordinary writers, what can be said about Ibne Qutaibah? 7. The writer has taken a large number of reports from scholars of Egypt, while the fact is that Ibne Qutaibah definitely did not go to Egypt and had not met those scholars.

Reply to the objections is very simple:

1- In spite of the statements and sayings of ancient scholars and elders of Ahle Sunnat regarding the attribution of this book to Ibne Qutaibah, there is no scope for the statements of unaware people and that too after a gap of centuries. Some of those who have clarified about the attribution of the book of *Al-Imamah was Siyasah* to Ibne Qutaibah Dinawari are as follows: Ibne Hajar Haithami in the book of *Tathirul Jinaan wal Lisan* [*Tathirul Jinaan wal Lisan*, Pg. 72,

Ibne Hajar Haithami, Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ali (d. 973 A.H.)] – Ibne Arabi Maliki in the book of *Al-Awasim Minal Qawasim*, under the points quoted from this book he has clarified about the attribution of this book to Ibne Qutaibah. (*Al-Awasim Minal Qawasim*, Vol. 1, Pg. 261, Ibne Arabi, d. 543 A.H.) – Najmuddin Umar bin Muhammad Makki, famous as Ibne Fahad in the book of *Al-Ittihaful Wara ba Akhabare Ummul Qura*, in the events of year 93 A.H. (*Al-Ittihaful Wara ba Akhabare Ummul Qura*, Ibne Fahad, events of 93 A.H.) – Qadi Abu Abdullah Tanuzi, alias Ibne Shabat in the book, *Al-Sila as-Simtiya* (*Al-Sila as-Simtiya*, Al-Tanuzi, Part II, Chapter 34) – Taqiuddin Fasi Makki in the book of *Al-Iqdul Thameen* (Fasi Makki, *Al-Iqdul Thameen*, Vol. 6, Pg. 72) and other clear statements of scholars and elders of Ahle Sunnat are also there, but we have refrained from quoting them all.

Some Ahle Sunnat senior scholars, in spite of accepting the reliability of attribution of this book to Ibne Qutaibah and admitting to the bitter and unbearable facts quoted in it from the early period of Islam, have blamed him why he has not distorted and censored the historical facts! On the contrary, why he has not, like others, refrained from quoting such facts?

Ibne Arabi has expressed following views in *Al-Awasim Minal Qawasim:*

The most unbearable of social matters is the existence of ignorant intellectuals and heretical fraudsters. Ignorant intellectuals are like Ibne Qutaibah, who in the book of *Al-Imamah was Siyasah*, has not observed the practice of concealing the defects of companions if the attribution of all matters of this book is correct.

Al-Awasim Minal Qawasim, Vol. 1, Pg. 261, Ibne Arabi (d. 543 A.H.)

2- As for the absence of the name of this book among his writings as seen in some books, the reply is that usually the biographers mention some books of the concerned person and then say: et al. They don't mention all the books of any writer.

3- As for the point that Ibne Qutaibah did not leave Baghdad, except for Dainawar. In order to disprove this claim, it would be better to refer to the book of Aalaam Zarkali, who says: He resided in Kufa! In the same way, it is mentioned in *Al-Muntazam*: He lived for sometime in Kufa also and it is here that he expired. (*Al-Muntazam*

fee Tarikh Muluk wal Umam, Vol. 12, Pg. 276, Abul Faraj Ibne Jauzi, d. 597 A.H.)

4- Narrating of the report by Abi Laila is in the form of message, an act, which many historians have performed. His quotation was through the channel of Laith.

5- With regard to Marakkseh and narrating the report about the conquest of Andulas, the reply is very simple: (a) He has narrated the event from very aged persons who were present in this battle. There are many aged people in history who have narrated historical facts; so much so that it is narrated that during the period of Harun there was a persons who had met the Holy Prophet (s). (b) It is possible that it is directly quoted, because it is present in excess in books of traditional reports. (c) With regard to certain points it is narrated from a lady who witnessed the conquest of Andulas on 92 A.H. It can also be said that in some versions the word of 'they mentioned' is mentioned, which completely removes the doubt. In the same way, it can be said that it has been dispatched here as well.

6- The reason for some doubts against his books is that he was a memorizer of 60000 traditional reports and he has narrated the matter for memory and his students have noted down from him. The instance of doubts is natural in such a case.

(*Al-Muntazam fee Tarikh Muluk wal Umam*, Vol. 12, Pg. 276, Abul Faraj Jauzi, d. 597 A.H.) Therefore arising of some doubts is possible and reasonable.

7- His quoting from the scholars of Egypt does not necessitate him to be present in Egypt, because numerous Egypt scholars used to frequently travel to Kufa and Shaam.

8- In the end it should be reminded that all deniers of attribution of this book to Ibne Qutaibah are from the later period and they are ignorant and weak persons. It is better that instead of referring to the statements of such persons one relies on the statements of ancient scholars, some of which we have quoted above.

[21] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 2, Pg. 46-47, Egypt

[22] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 233, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.

[23] *Tahdhibul Kamaal*, Vol. 30, Pg. 328, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi, d. 742, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut,

First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D. Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf

[24] On the basis of Abdullah bin Manda, Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari is the Imam of science of traditions. He says: In the places where Bukhari says: 'So and so said this': or 'so and so narrated to us'; this act of Bukhari is defrauding and being hypocritical to others in traditional reports.

Zikr Mudlaseen, Vol. 1, Pg. 24, Abu Abdur Rahman Ahmad bin Shuaib bin Ali Khorasani Nasai (d. 303)

[25] Abu Dawood and Bukhari in *Tarikh Kabir* (2/2234)

[26] Investigation into the report of Tabari:

1- Muhammad bin Hamid

Dhahabi has written about him as follows:

Allamah and great Hafiz, Muhammad bin Hamid, who was born around 160 A.H. Abu Zaraa has said about him: One who has not met Muhammad bin Hamid has lost ten thousand traditions. Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal says: I heard from my father that he said: As long as Muhammad bin Hamid lived in Rayy, knowledge and learning was strong. Abu Quraish Muhammad bin Jumah bin Khalaf says: I asked Muhammad bin Yahya: What do you say about Muhammad bin Hamid? He replied: But don't you see that I do not narrate traditions from him? Then he said: I was present in the gathering of Muhammad bin Ishaq, I saw that he was narrating traditions from Muhammad bin Hamid, I asked: Are you narrating reports from Muhammad bin Hamid? He replied: Why should I not when Ahmad bin Hanbal and Yahya bin Moin have narrated from him?

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 11, Pg. 503, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

Albani has corrected the reports of Muhammad bin Hamid:

Muhammad Nasir Albani, contemporary Wahabi writer in the books, *Sahih wa Zaeef Sunan Tirmidhi* and *Silsila Ahadith Sahihya* has corrected traditions, which had Muhammad bin Hamid in their chains of narrators.

I am supposing on the point that some have declared him as weak and some have testified to his veracity. Even then his reports are worthy of acceptance; because according to the rules of Ilme Rijal of Ahle Sunnat, reports of such a person are included in the 'Hasan' category and Hasan reports are decisive proofs (Hujjat) in view of Ahle Sunnat scholars.

2- Jarir bin Abdul Hamid bin Qurtubi:

He is a reporter of *Sahih Bukhari* and *Muslim* and Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* has written in his biographical account:

Muhammad bin Saad says: Jarir is worthy of confidence and he was very knowledgeable. People came to him to seek knowledge. Muhammad bin Abdullah Mosuli say: He was a decisive proof and all his books are 'Sahih'.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 4, Pg. 544, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj Mizzi (742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 11, Pg. 503, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413 A.H., Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

On the basis of this, the objection of Abdur Rahman Damishqiya who says:

Jarir bin Hazim, although he is an honest person, but sometimes he is involved in doubts and mistakes and as Abu Dawood has said he has mixed together the correct and incorrect reports.[Abu Dawood and Bukhari in *Tarikh Kabir* (2/2234)]

...is baseless and it is having two important objections:

First: Muhammad bin Hamid Raazi has narrated reports from Jarir bin Abdul Hamid and not from Jarir bin Hazim and this shows his lack of precision in the chains of narrators.

Secondly: Even if we suppose that Jarir bin Hazim also existed, it is not possible to doubt his trustworthiness; because he is also among the reporters of Bukhari, Muslim and other *Sihah Sitta*; on the basis of this, the objection of Damishqiya is absolutely baseless.

3- Mughira bin Miqsam Zabi

He is also among the reporters of *Bukhari, Muslim* and other *Sihah Sitta*.

Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* has written about him:

Yahya bin Moin says: He is worthy of confidence and he is honest. Nasai says: Mughira is reliable.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 28, Pg. 399, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

We also have questions from Abdur Rahman Damishqiya and it is that if Mughira bin Maqsam was a deceptive why Bukhari, Muslim and...have narrated from him?

4- Ziyad bin Kulayyab:

He is also among the reporters of *Sahih Muslim, Tirmidhi* and...

Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* has said in his biography:

Ahmad bin Abdullah Ajali: He was trustworthy with regard to traditional reports. Nasai says: He is reliable. Ibne Hibban says: He is among the steadfast memorizers and of firm actions; he passed away in the year 119.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 9, Pg. 505, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

We reply to the objection of Abdur Rahman Damishqiya with regard to the breaking off of his chains of narrators:

Firstly: As is hinted at in the report of Balazari, a senior scholar of Ahle Sunnat in the first century has admitted it, and the same point is sufficient to prove our assertion; even if he himself might not have witnessed the matter personally;

Secondly: All reports narrated from Ziyad bin Kulayyab are from persons who command absolute trust of Ahle Sunnat scholars.

[27] *Asbatul Wasiyya*, Pg. 143

[28] *Tabaqatush Shafiya*, Vol. 3, Pg. 456-457, No. 225, Daar Ahyaul Kutubul Arbiya.

[29] *Al-Mojam Kabir*, Vol. 1, Pg. 62, Sulaiman bin Ahmad bin Ayyub Abul Qasim Tibrani (d. 360 A.H.), Maktaba Zahra, Mosul, 1404 A.H. – 1983 A.D. Second edition, Edited: Hamdi bin Abdul Majeed Salafi;

Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 353, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut;

Tarikh Medina Damishq wa Zikr Fadhlaha wa Tasmiya man Halha minal Amail, Vol. 30, Pg. 418, Abul Qasim Ali bin Hasan Ibne Hibtullah bin Abdullah Shafei (d. 571 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1995, Edited: Mohibbuddin Abi Saeed Umar bin Ghrama Umari;

Tarikhul Islam wa Wafayatul Mashahir wal Aaalaam, Vol. 3, Pg. 118, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri;

Majamuz Zawaid wa Manbaul Fawaid, Vol. 5, Pg. 202, Ali bin Abu Bakr Haithami (d. 807 A.H.), Darul Riyan Lilturath/Dar Kitab al-Arabi – Cairo, - Beirut – 1407;

Al-Amwaal, Pg. 144, Abu Ubaid Qasim bin Salam (d. 224 A.H.), Footnote no. 4, Nashr Kulliyat Azhariya – wal Amwal, Vol. 1, Pg. 387, Abu Ahmad Hamid bin Mukhallad bin Qutaibah bin Abdullah, alias Ibne Zanjuya Khorasani (d. 251 A.H.);

Al-Imamah was Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 21, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari (d. 276 A.H.), Edited: Khalil al-Mansur, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1418 A.H. – 1997 A.D. Edited: Shiri, Vol. 1, Pg. 36, and Edited: Zaini, Vol. 1, Pg. 24;

Al-Iqdul Farid, Vol. 4, Pg. 254; Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Abde Rabb al-Andulasi (d. 328 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, Second edition, 1420 A.H. – 1999 A.D.;

Murujuz Zahab, Vol. 1, Pg. 290, Abul Hasan Ali bin Husain bin Ali al-Masudi (d. 346 A.H.);

Simtul Nujum al-Awali fee Anbail Awail wat Tawali, Vol. 2, Pg. 465, Abdul Malik bin Husain Abdul Malik Shafei Asimi Makki (d. 1111 A.H.), Edited: Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud – Ali Muhammad Maudh, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1419 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[30] *Al-Ahadithul Mukhtara*, Vol. 1, Pg. 90, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Abdul Wahid bin Ahmad Hanbali Muqaddasi (d. 643), Maktaba Nahzatul Haditha, Mecca – 1410, First edition, Edited: Abdul Malik bin Abdullah bin Dahish.

[31] *Tadkirah Huffaz*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1129, Abu Abdullah Shamsuddin Muhammad Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

[32] www.fnoor.com

[33] Investigation of the report of Tibrani:

1- Hamid bin Mukhallad bin Qutaibah bin Abdullah Azdi, (d. 248 or 251 A.H.). Author of *Kitabul Amwaal*:

Ibne Hajar has said regarding him:

Hamid bin Mukhallad bin Qutaibah bin Abdullah Azdi Abu Ahmad bin Zanjuya was a reliable and trustworthy person and he was the author of books as well.

Taqribut Tahdhib, Vol. 1, Pg. 182, No. 1558, Ibne Hajar Asqalani.

2- Uthman bin Salih bin Safwan Sahmi (d. 219 A.H.) is among the reporters of Bukhari, Nasai and Ibne Majah:

Uthman bin Salih bin Safwan Sahmi was the freed slave of Abu Yahya Misri Saduq.

Taqribut Tahdhib, Vol. 1, Pg. 384, No. 4480, Ibne Hajar Asqalani.

3- Laith bin Saad Laith bin Saad bin Abdur Rahman Sahmi (d. 175 A.H.) is among the reporters of Bukhari, Muslim and...

Taqribut Tahdhib, Vol. 1, Pg. 464, No. 5684, Ibne Hajar Asqalani.

4- Ulwan bin Dawood has relied on him in the text.

5- Salih bin Kisan (d. after 130 or 140 A.H.) is among the reporters of *Sahih Bukhari, Muslim* and...

Taqribut Tahdhib, Vol. 1, Pg. 273, No. 2884, Ibne Hajar Asqalani.

6- Hamid bin Abdur Rahman bin Auf (d. 105 A.H.) was among the reporters of *Sahih Bukhari* and *Muslim.*

Taqribut Tahdhib, Vol. 1, Pg. 182, No. 1552, Ibne Hajar Asqalani.

7- Abdur Rahman bin Auf was a companion and that is why he possessed absolute integrity and therefore, as per the principles of Ahle Sunnat science of narrators there is no need of any investigation about him.

[34] *Al-Thiqat,* Vol. 8, No. 14829, Muhammad bin Hibban bin Ahmad Abu Hatim Tamimi Basti (d. 354), Darul Fikr, 1395 – 1975, First edition, Edited: Sayyid Sharafuddin Ahmad.

[35] And that which is said about the latitudarianism of Ibne Hibban is incorrect:

Tadribur Rawi fee Sharh Taqribul Nawawi, Vol. 1, Pg. 108, Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr Suyuti (d. 911), Maktabe Riyadhul Haditha, Riyadh, Edited: Abdul Wahab Abdul Latif.

[36] *Munkar* reports are those, which are difficult to be accepted.

[37] *Lisanul Mizan*, Vol. 2, Pg. 307, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 752), Mausasal Aalami Lil Matbuat, Beirut. 1406 – 1986, Third edition, Edited: Dairatul Marifa Nizamiya, India.

[38] *Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam*, Vol. 3, Pg. 118, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.). Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri

[39] *Tarikh Medina Damishq wa Zikr Fadhlaha wa Tasmiya man Halha minal Amail*, Vol. 30, Pg. 417 - 419, Abul Qasim Ali bin Hasan Ibne Hibtullah bin Abdullah Ibne Asakir Shafei, (d. 571 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1995, Edited: Mohibbuddin Abi Saeed Umar bin Ghrama Umari.

And after narrating the report, he says:

Madaini has also narrated this report from Laith and in that he has not mentioned the name of Ulwan bin Dawood and the report we have quoted from Laith in which Ulwan is mentioned, it is narrated through a shorter chain of narrators.

[40] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 3, Pg. 406, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.).

[41] *Umdatul Qari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 3, Pg. 307, Badruddin Mahmud bin Ahmad Aini (d. 855 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[42] *Kutub wa Rasail wa Fatawa Shaykhul Islam Ibne Taymiyyah*, Vol. 18, Pg. 26, Ahmad Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Harrani, Abul Abbas (d. 728), Maktaba Ibne Taymiyyah, Second edition, Edited: Abdur Rahman bin Muhammad bin Qasim Asmi Najdi.

[43] *Arwaul Ghulail fee Takhrij Ahadith Minar as-Sabeel*, Vol. 1, Pg. 160, Muhammad Nasir Albani, Edited: Ishraf: Zahir Shawish, Makatabe Islami – Beirut – Lebanon, Second edition, 1405 – 1985 A.D.

[44] *Jamiul Ahadith (Al-Jamiul Saghir, wa Zaida wa Jamiul Kabir)*, Vol. 13, Pg. 101 and Vol. 14, Pg. 48, Jalaluddin Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.)

Musnad Fatima, Pg. 34 & 35, Jalaluddin Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.), Mausisatul Kutub Thaqafiya, Beirut, First edition;

Kanzul Ummal fee Sunanil Aqwal wa Afaal, Vol. 5, Pg. 252, Alauddin Ali Muttaqi bin Husamuddin Hindi (d. 975 A.H.), Edited: Mahmud Umar Damyati, Darul Kutub Ilmiya. Beirut, First edition, 1419 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

Dhahabi has written regarding the reliability and position of Saeed bin Mansur in the view of Ahle Sunnat:

Saeed bin Mansur, was Hafiz, Imam and Shaykh Haram...he was an intelligent person, he was reliable and a truthful person. Abu Hatim Raazi has introduced him to be a reliable and a strong writer and compiler.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 10, Pg. 586, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

And he says in *Tadkiratul Huffaz*:

Saeed bin Mansur bin Shoba was Hafiz, Imam and final proof...

Tadkiratul Huffaz, Vol. 2, Pg. 416, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

[45] *Al-Ahadith Mukhtara*, Vol. 1, Pg. 90, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Abdul Wahid bin Ahmad Muqaddasi Hanbali (d. 643 A.H.), Edited: Abdul Malik bin Abdullah Dahish, Maktaba Nahzatul Haditha, Mecca – 1410, First edition.

Position of Muqaddasi Hanbali in view of Ahle Sunnat scholars:

Dhahabi has written about him:

Ziya Muqaddasi is the leader of Hafiz, intellectual and traditionist of the people of Shaam: he was the teacher of traditions and the author of useful books...

Tadkiratul Huffaz, Vol. 4, Pg. 1405, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

And many other praises of senior Ahle Sunnat scholars, which we have not mentioned and each of them increases the position of the report hundred times.

[46] *Al-Iqdul Farid*, Vol. 3, Pg. 63; Ibne Abde Rabb. Egypt

[47] *Al-Istiab fee Marifatul Ashab*, Vol. 3, Pg. 975, Yusuf bin

Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abde Barr (d. 463), Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1412, First edition, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi.

Al-Kitabul Musannaf fee al-Ahadith wal Aathaar, Ibne Abu Shaybah, Vol. 7, Pg. 432; Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad Abi Shaybah (d. 235 A.H.), Maktabe Rushd, Riyadh, First edition, 1409 A.H., Edited: Kamaal Yusuf Alhut.

[48] *Al-Imamah wal Khilafah*, Maqatil bin Atiyyah, Pg. 160 and 161, which is published with the foreword of Dr. Hamid Dawood, professor of Ainush Shams University, Cairo, Beirut, Mausisatul Balagh.

[49] And order to learn about the personality and rank of Juwaini refer to the introduction of part one of this book under the prediction of the Messenger of Allah (s) about the martyrdom of Lady Fatima (s) in Ahle Sunnat sources.

[50] *Faraidus Simtain*, Vol. 2, Pg. 345 & 35

[51] 'Hatib Lail' is a person who gathers firewood in the darkness of the night without knowing what he is doing.

[52] *Fathul Mughith Sharh Alfiyatul Hadith*, Vol.3, Pg. 4, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Abdur Rahman Sakhawi (d. 902 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Lebanon, First edition. 1403 A.H.

[53] With regard to the praise and admiration of Dhahabi towards Juwaini refer to the preface of this book under the topic of prediction of the Messenger of Allah (s) about the martyrdom of Lady Fatima (s) in Ahle Sunnat sources.

[54] Hafiz Jalaluddin Suyuti, famous litterateur, traditionist, historian and exegesist of Ahle Sunnat, author of books: *Durre Manthur, Al-Jami Saghir, Tarikhul Khulafa, Deebaj Ala Muslim, Al-Itqan fee Uloomul Quran, Tanvirul Hawalik* and...he is such a person about whom no doubt can be leveled, in spite of that they have said that he was 'Hatib Lail'.

Muhammad Abu Riya, a contemporary Ahle Sunnat scholar, writes about him:

May Allah have mercy on one who said with regard to Suyuti that he was 'Hatib Lail'.

Az-Zawaa Alas Sunnatul Muhammadiya, Pg. 235, Mahmud Abu Riya (d. 1385 A.H.), with foreword of Dr. Taha Husayn, Nashrul Batha, Fifth edition.

[55] Abu Ishaq Thalabi is among the senior Ahle Sunnat scholars, a writer of Tafsir famous as *Al-Kashf wal Bayan*, is one who is accused to be 'Hatib Lail'.

Ibne Taymiyyah Harrani says about him in *Minhajus Sunnah*:

Intellectuals have consensus that Thalabi and his like all of them have narrated genuine as well as weak traditional reports, and also they do not consider it necessary to accept every traditional report, which Thalabi has narrated; from this aspect they have called Thalabi and people like him to be 'Hatib Lail', because they have narrated whatever they found and saw; whether correct or not; although most of his traditional reports are genuine, but among them according to the consensus of scholars there exist false reports as well.

Minhajus Sunnatun Nabawiya, Vol. 7, Pg. 90, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Abul Abbas Harrani (d. 728 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Salim, Mausisa Qurtuba, First edition, 1406 A.H.

Whereas Dhahabi has praised him in excess and he writes:

(Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ibrahim) Abu Ishaq Nishapuri Thalabi, author of *Tafsir*, he was a unique personage of his times in sciences of Quran...a moral teacher, intellectual, Hafiz and an authority in Arabic, he was reliable and Abul Hasan Wahidi has narrated traditions from him.

Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 29, Pg. 186, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri.

[56] Ibne Hajar Asqalani in the biography of Thamama bin Ashras, after the mention of the story, which Ibne Jauzi has narrated about Thamama, says:

...this story proves that Ibne Jauzi was 'Hatib Lail', that is he has not exercised necessary care in what he has written or narrated.

Lisanul Mizan, Vol. 2, Pg. 83, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani, Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Edited: Dairatul Marifa Nizamiya India, Mausasal Aalami Lil Matbuat, Beirut, Third edition, 1406 A.H. – 1986 A.D.

Whereas Dhahabi in *Seer Aalamun Nubla* has praised Ibne Jauzi as follows:

Abul Faraj was a teacher, a leader, a most learned (*Allamah*), Hafiz, exegesist, a senior one of Islam, pride of the people of Iraq...one without any equal, he was a powerful poet and a skillful writer..., he carried the standard of morals on his shoulders. In exegesis he was like a sea. He was the most learned scholar of his time in history and biography. According to the consensus of scholars, his traditions were good and he was an intelligent jurist.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 21, Pg. 365-366, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Dhahabi (d. 748), Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, Ninth edition, 1413 A.H.

[57] Ibne Taymiyyah Harrani, founder and theoretician of Wahabi beliefs, he is also one who has earned the title of 'Hatib Lail'.

Taqiuddin Hasani Damishqi has written in *Dafe Shubah bin Shubah*:

Abul Hasan Ali Damishqi has narrated from his father in the courtyard of the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus that: We were in the gathering of Ibne Taymiyyah when topic arose of the sitting of Almighty Allah on the throne (*Arsh*), he said: Almighty Allah sits like we sit here. People attacked him and pulled him down from the pulpit. They thrashed him and then brought him to the Qadi. Intellectuals surrounded him and asked: On what basis have you said this? He replied: On the basis of the statement of Allah that: 'The Beneficent Lord is firm in power'. All of them smiled and understood that he was a fool. Some said that he is 'Hatib Lail'.

Dafe Shubah bin Shubah wa Tamard, Vol. 1, Pg. 41, Taqiuddin Abi Bakr Hasani Damishqi (d. 829 A.H.), Maktabe Azhariya Lit Turath, Egypt.

[58] Maqbal al-Widai is a contemporary Ahle Sunnat scholar and student of Muhammad Nasir Albani. He writes quoting from Ibne Hajar 'Asqalani that even Zamakhshari and Ghazzali have been given the title of 'Hatib Lail'; he writes in *Muqtarah*:

Hafiz Iraqi in his book, *Takhrijul Ahya* and Haithami in *Zawaid* have said: In the chain of narrators of so and so report there are reporters whose account of life I have neither seen nor heard. And in *Takhrijul Kashaf* sometimes it is said: I did not get the tradition, because Zamakhshari and in the same way. Ghazzali were 'Hatib Lail'.

Al-Muqtarah fee Ajubata Asalatul Mustalah, Vol. 1, Pg. 89, Abu Abdur Rahman Maqbal bin Hadi Al-Widai (d. 1422 A.H.), Darul Aathar, Sanaa, Second edition.

[59] *Minhajus Sunnatun Nabawiya*, Vol. 7, Pg. 90, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Abul Abbas Harrani (d. 728 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Salim, Mausisa Qurtuba, First edition. 1406 A.H.

[60] *Tarikh Abul Fida*, Vol. 1, Pg. 156, Al-Matba Husainia, Egypt.

[61] *Al-Wafi bil Wafayat*, Vol. 5, Pg. 347

[62] *Rauzatul Manazir fee Akhbaril Awail wa Awakhir* (Margins of *Kamil* Ibne Athir), Vol. 11, Pg. 113. (Published Halabi, Afandi, Year 1301)

[63] *Lisanul Mizan*, Vol. 1, Pg. 268, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Mausasal Aalami Lil Matbuat, Beirut. 1406 – 1986. Third edition, Edited: Dairatul Marifa Nizamiya India.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 15, Pg. 578, Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut. 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

Mizanul Etedal fee Naqdur Rijal, Vol. 1, Pg. 283, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad Dhahabi, (d. 748), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1995, First edition, Edited: Ali Muhammad Maudh and Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud.

[64] Ibne Abi Daram: Imam, Hafiz and learned, Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Muhammad Sirru bin Yahya bin Sirri bin Abi Daram.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 15, Pg. 576, No. 349. Biography of Ibne Abi Daram, Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[65] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 15, Pg. 577, No. 349, Biography of Ibne Abi Daram, Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[66] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 15, Pg. 578, No. 349, Biography of Ibne Abi Daram, Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413,

Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[67] *Mizanul Etedal*, Vol. 1, Pg. 139, No. 552, Biography of Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Sirri bin Yahya bin Abi Daram Muhaddith Abu Bakr Kufi. *Lisanul Mizan*, Ibne Hajar Asqalani, No. 825, Biography Ahmad bin Muhammad Sirri bin Yahya bin Abi Daram Muhaddith Abu Bakr Kufi.

[68] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 15, Pg. 578, No. 349, Biography of Ibne Abi Daram. Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[69] I present a few instances by way of examples:

1- Abdullah bin Musa: Dhahabi says regarding him:

He was famous as a Rafidi.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 9, Pg. 556, Biography of Ubaidullah bin Musa, No. 215.

2- Ja'far bin Sulaiman Zabi (Ahle Sunnat scholars have mentioned him as a Rafidi and an extremist Shia)

Khatib Baghdadi has narrated from Yazid bin Zari that he said:

Indeed Ja'far bin Sulaiman is a Rafidi.

Tarikh Baghdad, Vol. 5, Pg. 372, Biography of Ahmad bin Miqdam bin Sulaiman bin Ashath bin Aslam bin Suwaid bin Asad bin Rabia bi Sinan Abul Ashath Ajali Basri, No. 2925

3- Abdul Malik bin Ayyin Kufi

Mizzi has narrated from Sufyan that: He is a Rafidi.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 18, Pg. 283, Biography of Abdul Malik bin Ayyin Kufi, No. 3514

And on another occasion, he writes:

He was asked about Fazal bin Muhammad Sherani; he said: He is honest in narrating reports, but it is doubted that he is more inclined to Shiaism. He was asked: He is quoted in Sahih books. He said: Book of my teacher (*Sahih Muslim*) is full of Shia reports!

Al-Kifaya fee Ilmur Riwaya, Pg. 195, No. 349

[70] In view of some Ahle Sunnat scholars of science of narrators, including Ibne Hajar Asqalani in the preface of *Fathul Bari*, extremist Rafidi (harsh Shia or extremism in Shiaism) is one who in

addition to being considering Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) as the most superior curse and invoke against those two and Shia is one who only considers His Eminence to be superior to Abu Bakr and Umar. In his book, he has defined Shia and Rafidi as follows:

Shiaism: Being devoted to Ali (a) and considering him to be superior to all companions, but if someone considers Ali (a) to be superior to Abu Bakr and Umar, he has been extremist about Ali (a) and he is an extremist and is called as *Rafidi*, but if he is only devoted to him, he is a Shia and if he in addition to being devoted to Ali, talks ill of the companions and expresses his enmity to them, he is an Extremist Shia (*Ghali*).

Hadial Sari, Muqaddima Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 1, Pg. 459, Abul Fadhl Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut – 1379, Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Muhibuddin Khatib.

[71] *Tahdhibut Tahdhib*, Vol. 7, Pg. 149, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazal Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, First edition, 1404 A.H. – 1984 A.D.

[72] He is among the reporters of *Sunan Tirmidhi* and he has cursed Abu Bakr and Umar. Mizzi writes about him:

Abu Dawood has said: He is a debased Rafidi and a wicked man and he has abused Abu Bakr and Umar...Abbas Dauri, in another place has said with regard to Talid bin Sulaiman: He is a great liar and has abused Uthman and one who abuses Uthman, Talha or any other companion is Anti-Christ (Dajjal) and his traditions are not written and the curse of Allah, all people and angels be on him.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 4, Pg. 321, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.). Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

[73] Shamsuddin Dhahabi says with regard to him:

He has narrated some things in which he is alone in narrating them and he his accused of being a Shia. He has resorted to extremism in being a Shia, he was devoted to Ali and was inimical to those who fought Ali.

Tadkirah Huffaz, Vol. 1, Pg. 364, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

In *Mizanul Etedal* and *Seer Aalamun Nubla,* he writes:

I heard from Mukhallad Shairi that he said: I was with Abdur Razzaq, when mention was made of Muawiyah. Abdur Razzaq said: Do not contaminate my gathering with the mention of Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan.

Mizanul Etedal fee Naqdur Rijal, Vol. 4, Pg. 343, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Edited: Shaykh Ali Muhammad Maudh and Shaykh Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition, 1995 A.D.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 9, Pg. 570, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, Ninth edition, 1413 A.H.

Objection of Abdur Razzaq to Umar:

Dhahabi says in *Mizanul Etedal:*

I heard Ali bin Abdullah bin Mubarak Sanani say: Zaid bin Mubarak was the companion of Abdur Razzaq and he had heard much from him; but in the end he tore up his books and adopted the companionship of Muhammad bin Thawr. When they asked him about it, he said: I was with Abdur Razzaq when the tradition of Ibne Hadsan was mentioned, when he reached to the part when Umar said to Ali and Abbas: You have come to take the share of inheritance of your nephew and Ali has come to take the inheritance of his wife from her father, Abdur Razzaq said: See this fool is saying: inheritance of his nephew, he does not say: The Messenger of Allah (s).That is why I left him and never went back to him; I also do not narrate traditions from him.

Mizanul Etedal fee Naqdur Rijal, Vol. 4, Pg. 343, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Edited: Shaykh Ali Muhammad Maudh and Shaykh Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition, 1995 A.D.

Appreciation of Abdur Razzaq:

Dhahabi has said with regard to Abdur Razzaq:

In *Sihah* books, traditions are narrated from him and he was highly learned.

Tadkirah Huffaz, Vol. 1, Pg. 364, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition.

A sincere defense of Abdur Razzaq:

Hakim Nishapuri in *Marifate Uluumul Hadith*, Shamsuddin Dhahabi in *Seer Aalamun Nubla* and Ibne Hajar in *Tahdhibut Tahdhib* has quoted the statement of Yahya bin Moin that he said:

If Abdur Razzaq also apostates from Islam, even then I will not leave his traditions.

Marifate Uluumul Hadith, Vol. 1, Pg. 139, Muhammad bin Abdullah Abu Abdullah Hakim Nishapuri (d. 405 A.H.), Edited: Sayyid Moazzam Husain, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, Second edition, 1397 A.H. – 1977 A.D.

Seer Aalamun Nubla, Vol. 9, Pg. 573, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, Ninth edition, 1413 A.H.

Tahdhibut Tahdhib, Vol. 6, Pg. 280, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, First edition, 1404 A.H. – 1984 A.D.

[74] Ahmad bin Sulaiman Maruzi has narrated from Ismail bin Ayyash that he said: I accompanied Huraiz bin Uthman from Egypt to Mecca. During this period he spoke ill of Ali (a) and cursed him.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 5, Pg. 576, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 10, Pg. 123, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri.

Ibne Hajar Asqalani writes:

Ibne Hibban says: He cursed Ali (a) seventy times every morning and evening. When he was asked the reason for it, he replied: He decapitated my father and ancestors.

Tahdhibut Tahdhib, Vol. 2, Pg. 209, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, First edition, 1404 A.H. – 1984 A.D.

[75] Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* and Ibne Hajar Asqalani has said in his appreciation:

They inquired about him from Ahmad bin Hanbal, he said twice: He is trustworthy (extremely reliable) and he also said: In Syria there is no one more confident in traditions and sayings than Huraiz.

Maaz bin Maaz says: When Huraiz, Abu Bakr bin Maryam and Safwan were mentioned before Ahmad bin Hanbal, I heard him say: Among them none is as reliable as Huraiz. On another occasion I heard from Ahmad that he said twice: Huraiz is reliable.

Tahdhibut Tahdhib, Vol. 2, Pg. 209, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, First edition, 1404 A.H. – 1984 A.D.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 5, Pg. 572, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

Ibne Hajar has written at the beginning of his account:

He is a reporter of Bukhari and other four *Sahihs* of Ahle Sunnat (except *Sahih Muslim*).

[76] Mizzi in *Tahdhibul Kamaal* and Ibne Hajar in *Tahdhibut Tahdhib* have said about Umar bin Saad, the famous commander of Yazidites in Kerbala:

Ijli says: Umar bin Saad has narrated traditions from his father and others have quoted from him. He was a companion of companions (*Tabii*) and he was trustworthy. He was among those who killed Husain (a).

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 21, Pg. 357, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

Tahdhibut Tahdhib, Vol. 7, Pg. 396, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, First edition, 1404 A.H. – 1984 A.D.

[77] Collected works

[78] *Diwan Muhammad Hafiz Ibrahim*, Vol. 1, Pg. 82

[79] *Elamun Nisa*, Vol. 4, Pg. 114, Fifth edition, Beirut – 1404 A.H. Section of letter 'F'; Fatima binte Muhammad (s).

[80] *Al-Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib*, Abdul Fatah Abdul Maqsood, Vol. 4, Pg. 274-277 and Vol. 1, Pg. 192-193

[81] *Al-Majmuatul Kamilah Al-Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib*, Abdul Fattah

Abdul Maqsood, Translated (into Persian) by Sayyid Mahmud Taliqani, Vol. 1, Pg. 190-192.

Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a). Abdul Fatah Abdul Maqsood, Translated by Sayyid Mahmud Taliqani. Vol. 1. Pg. 326-328, Third edition, Haidery Offset Printing Press.

[82] *Qaratu fee Kutubul Aqaid Al-Madhhabul Hanbali Namuzajjan,* Pg. 52, Chapter of Will of Abu Bakr appointing Umar to Caliphate and the stance of Muslim towards it; Al-Maliki, Hasan bin Farhan, Markazul Darasatul Tarikhiya Amman – Jordan, First edition, 1421 A.H. – 2000 A.D.

[83] *Qaratu fee Kutubul Aqaid Al-Madhhabul Hanbali Namuzajjan,* Pg. 52, Chapter of Will of Abu Bakr appointing Umar to Caliphate and the stance of Muslim towards it; Al-Maliki, Hasan bin Farhan, Markazul Darasatul Tarikhiya, Amman – Jordan, First edition, 1421 A.H. – 2000 A.D.

PART TWO: OBJECTIONS AND REPLIES

OBJECTION I:
IF FATIMA (S) WAS INITIALLY ANGRY AT ABU BAKR AND UMAR, SHE RECONCILED DURING HER FINAL DAYS

EXPLANATION

It is natural that if Wahabis admit that Lady Fatima Zahra (s) had become angry and infuriated at Abu Bakr and Umar and she passed away in that same condition, the legality of origin and foundation of their Caliphate will come under question, as it proves that the only daughter of the Prophet, and the most superior lady of the two worlds, leader of ladies of Paradise had opposed their Caliphate and according to authentic and correct traditional reports, which have come in their own most authentic books, pleasure of Fatima is pleasure of the Prophet and her anger is anger of the Prophet, therefore, they have tried to conceal this fact and fabricated traditions saying:

> Suppose we accept that Fatima (r) was infuriated at Abu Bakr and Umar for a period of time and she turned away from the two of then, but as Baihaqi and others have narrated, Abu Bakr and Umar during the final days of Lady Fatima (s) came to meet her and sought her pardon, because it is mentioned in traditional reports that:
>
> When Fatima became indisposed, Abu Bakr came to her to seek her pardon and asked for permission to meet her. Ali (a) asked Fatima (s): Abu Bakr is asking permission to meet you. Fatima (s) said: Do you allow him to enter? Ali (a) replied: Yes. So Lady Fatima (s)

accorded permission. Abu Bakr entered and sought the forgiveness of Fatima (s). Abu Bakr said: By God, I have not left home, life, property, wealth and relatives, except for the pleasure of God, Messenger and you, family of Prophet. It was at this time that Fatima (s) became reconciled to Abu Bakr.[1]

RATIONAL REPLY

A. Report is Mursal (with incomplete chain) and the narrator is inimical to Ahle Bayt (Nasibi)

In reply, we say:

Firstly: As mentioned in the first part of this book, Wahabis have raised doubts about the chain of narrators of Balazari and Tabari regarding martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s) and considered it unacceptable, because it was *Mursal*; but now they are themselves arguing through a *Mursal* and false report, because Shobi was a companion of companions (*Tabii*) and therefore, he could not have witnessed this incident himself.

Also: Perhaps the objection maker has resorted to the reply that we used in the report of Balazari and Tabari from their own principles of the science of narrators and we said *Mursal* traditions of companion of companions (*Tabii*) is proof for Ahle Sunnat and has turned the same reply against us; in reply, we say: Suppose the *Mursal* reports of *Tabii* is acceptable, even then we cannot accept the report of Shobi, because he was among the enemies of Amirul Momineen (a) a *Nasibi* person; that is why reports of such a person, and that too against Ahle Bayt (a) cannot be accepted. With regard to the enmity of Shobi to Amirul Momineen (a), Balazari and Abu Hamid Ghazzali have quoted from Shobi himself:

I met Hajjaj with some people in the city of Basra. Some *Qaris* (reciters of Quran) of Medina from the descendants of

emigrants and helpers, including Abu Salma bin Abdur Rahman bin Auf, were also present there. Hajjaj was in conversation with them, when he mentioned Ali Ibne Abi Talib and spoke ill of him, we also spoke ill of Ali (a) in order to please Hajjaj and to remain secure from his mischief...[2]

Can the reports of *Nasibis* and enemies of Amirul Momineen (a) be decisive proofs for us?

B. Displeasure of Fatima (s) with Abu Bakr in the most authentic Ahle Sunnat books

The objection maker has no choice but to accept the original anger and displeasure of Fatima (s) with Abu Bakr, because this fact is even mentioned by Bukhari in his book. Is the report of Bukhari having precedence or the report of Baihaqi? And that also when the report of Baihaqi is from a *Nasibi* person and enemy of Amirul Momineen (a) and he has not witnessed the incident personally. Bukhari says in his *Sahih*:

Fatima (s), daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) became angry and displeased with Abu Bakr and this anger continued till she passed away from the world.[3]

He has also mentioned in his book:

> Fatima (s) became furious at Abu Bakr and did not speak to him till she passed away.[4]

In another place, he has mentioned the following report:

> Fatima (s) turned away from Abu Bakr and did not speak to him till she passed away.[5]

It is mentioned in the report of Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari that when the two of them came to visit her, Fatima Zahra (s) did not accord permission to enter and they became helpless. They sought the mediation of Amirul Momineen (a) and when Amirul Momineen (a) mentioned this to Lady Zahra (s), she said:

> Ali dear, this house belongs to you; you are authorized to permit anyone you like to enter.

Amirul Momineen (a), in order to exhaust proof and that the two of them should not put up excuse later on that we wanted to apologize to Fatima (s), but Ali did not allow, he allowed them to come in.

When the two of them sought forgiveness, Lady Fatima Zahra (s) did not forgive; on the contrary, she made them confess as follows: I adjure you in the name of Allah; have you two not heard the Messenger of Allah (s) say: Fatima's pleasure is my pleasure and her displeasure is my displeasure; one who considers my daughter, Fatima dear and accords respect to her has considered me dear and accorded respect to me. And one who pleases her has pleased me. And one who makes Fatima angry has displeased me. Those two admitted having heard that. Yes, we heard this from the Messenger of Allah (s). Lady Fatima (s) said: Thus, I hold Allah and His angels as witness that you two have harassed me and made me infuriated. I will complain about you to my father when I meet him. [Lady Zahra (s) did not remain content with this and she further said]: By Allah, I will pray against you after every ritual prayer.[6]

In these circumstances how can it be believed that Martyred Truthful Lady became reconciled to them? Is the report of Bukhari superior or the report of Baihaqi? And also when the report of Baihaqi is from a *Nasibi* person and one who is inimical to Amirul Momineen (a); and he had also not witnessed that event directly?

Moreover, it is also mentioned that: If Lady Fatima Zahra (s) had become reconciled to them, why did she make a will that she must be buried during the night and none of those who had oppressed her should be informed about her funeral and funeral prayers. Bukhari has narrated in his *Sahih*:

> Lady Fatima (s) lived for six months after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s) and when she passed away, her husband, Ali (a) buried her at night and did not inform Abu Bakr and recited her funeral prayers himself.[7]

Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari writes in *Tawil Mukhtaliful Hadith*:

> Fatima demanded from Abu Bakr the inheritance of her father and when Abu Bakr refused, she swore that she would never speak to him again and she made a will that she should be buried at night so that Abu Bakr may not attend her funeral.[8]

And Abdur Razzaq Sanani writes:

> It is narrated from Hasan bin Muhammad that he said: Fatima, daughter of the Prophet was buried at night so that Abu Bakr may not pray her funeral prayers, because there was enmity between them.[9]

And he further continues:

> A similar report is narrated from Hasan bin Muhammad with the difference that in it is mentioned that: Fatima made will to be buried at night.[10]

In addition to what is mentioned above, we say: Repentance is only beneficial and useful when it is accompanied with regret from the depth of the heart of man and when he also makes amends of what has passed; in such a way that the one who is repenting should restore the rights of the opposite party, whether from the rights of Allah or rights of people.

Now, our question is: If, according to the claim of the objection maker, Abu Bakr was really regretful of his past actions, did he take any step to restore Fadak to Lady Fatima Zahra (s) to prove his sincere regrets?

NOTES

[1] *Al-Itiqad wal Hidaya Ilaa Sabeelar Rishad Alaa Madhhabus Salaf wa As-habul Hadith*, Vol. 1, Pg. 354, Ahmad bin al-Husain Baihaqi (d. 458 A.H.), Edited: Ahmad Isamul Katib; Darul Afaqul Jadida – Beirut, First edition, 1401 A.H.

[2] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 4. Pg. 315, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.); *Ihya Uloomiddin*, Vol. 2, Pg. 346, Muhammad bin Muhammad Abu Hamid Ghazzali (d. 505 A.H.), Darul Marifah – Beirut.

[3] *Al Jamius Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1126, Chapter of the obligation of Khums, Tradition 2926, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Deebal Bagha, Dar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 A.H. - 1987

[4] *Al Jamius Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1549, Tradition 3998, Kitabul Maghazi, Chapter of the Battle of Khyber, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Deebal Bagha, Dar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 A.H. - 1987

[5] *Al Jamius Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 6, Pg. 2474, Tradition 6346, Kitabul Faraid, Chapter of saying of the Prophet: We do not inherit, whatever we leave Sadaqah, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Deebal Bagha, Dar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 A.H. - 1987

[6] *Al-Imamah was Siyasah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 17, Chapter of How the allegiance of Ali (a) took place, Al-Dainawari, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah (d. 276 A.H.), Edited: Khalil Mansur, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, 1418 A.H. – 1997 A.D.

[7] *Al Jamius Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1549, Tradition 3998, Kitabul Maghazi, Chapter of the Battle of Khyber, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Deebal Bagha, Dar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 A.H. - 1987

[8] *Tawil Mukhtalifil Hadith*, Vol. 1, Pg. 300, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah Al-Dainawari, (d. 276 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Zuhri al-Najjar, Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1393, 1972

[9] *Musannaf Abdur Razzaq*, Vol. 3, Pg. 521, tradition 6554, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[10] *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 3, Pg. 521, tradition 6555, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

OBJECTION 2:
NOCTURNAL BURIAL OF FATIMA (S) WAS DUE TO ANOTHER CAUSE

EXPLANATION

Among the doubts and objections, which they have raised against the topic of martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) is that her nocturnal burial is not due to the cause which Shia believe; that it was not due to her enmity to the rulers; on the contrary, it was because she had made a bequest to Asma binte Umais (wife of Abu Bakr) that after her death no stranger (*Namehram*) should be able to see the shape of her body.

Such objections are mentioned in different words and we present one of them, which is present on Wahabi websites as follows:

> Shia always misuse the topic of concealment of the location of the grave of the daughter of the Prophet (s) to instigate emotions and as a tool of propagating their ideas, but they are not aware that if this matter was a crime, the Shia themselves are culpable for it first of all.

We say to Shia: The grave of Lady Fatima (r) was known to Ali, Hasan and Husain (r) and its location was certainly known to their descendants: Sajjad, Baqir, Sadiq and their other descendants. Now, the most important question is whether these Shia Imams went to the grave of Fatima and performed the Ziyarat or not? If they did not do so, why do you want to perform this act and do that which they did not like and which is against Islamic law? And if they did visit it; it can be either of the two: either they did so secretly or openly. If they did so secretly, they had themselves concealed the location of the grave of their mother from the people, and

it is not a sin. And if it is a sin, it is their sin and not the crime of Abu Bakr and Umar, but if they visited it openly, the 4000 students of Imam Sadiq (a) should also have been aware of it. Then why do you accuse us of this?[1]

RATIONAL REPLY

Nocturnal burial, funeral prayers without informing the ruler of the time, with a concealed grave, is a secret having unutterable mysteries. It is correct that this lady wanted this and she made bequest in this way, but what a coincidence that Lady Zahra (s) completed her historical bequest with these requests?!

But is not the most important message of this bequest declaration of her anger and displeasure with those who harassed her?

Lady Fatima (s), in fact through these steps, has posed some questions before the sharp sight of history and the coming generations so that these questions are raised all the time that why the grave of Fatima is unknown? Why the daughter of the Prophet was buried during the night and secretly? Why Ali (a) recited her funeral prayers without informing Abu Bakr and Umar? Can one who is the successor of the Prophet (as they have themselves claimed) is not eligible to recite her funeral prayer? And why and why...

Yes, Fatima made a will that she must be buried at night and none of those who have harassed should be informed and this is the best evidence of her victimization, so that it may be proved that she was oppressed and she departed from the world as a martyr and she was never reconciled to those had oppressed her.

Numerous traditional reports have been recorded in Shia and Sunni books, which prove this claim; and some of them are mentioned as follows in brief:

A. Cause of nocturnal burial in the reports of Ahle Sunnat

That which is important in this and is a direct reply to the captioned question is that why Lady Zahra (s) made a will that she should be laid to rest during the night?

Before hinting at some of the reports in this regard, it is necessary to mention the reports about the actual topic of nocturnal burial in *Sahih Bukhari*. Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari writes:

> Fatima Zahra (s) lived for six months after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s). When she passed away, her husband buried her at night and did not inform Abu Bakr.[2]

And as for the cause of her nocturnal burial; it is hinted at in numerous reports of Ahle Sunnat books.

In his book, Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari has clearly discussed the cause of nocturnal burial of Fatima and he says:

> Fatima demanded from Abu Bakr the inheritance of her father, but Abu Bakr did not agree. Therefore Fatima swore that she would never speak to Abu Bakr again and she made a will that she should be buried at night, so that Abu Bakr may not attend her funeral.[3]

Abdur Razzaq Sanani has also clearly discussed the cause of nocturnal burial in his book:

> Fatima, daughter of the Prophet, was buried at night, so that Abu Bakr may not pray her funeral prayers, because there was enmity between them.[4]

Also, Ibne Battal has written in his *Sharh Sahih Bukhari*:

> Most scholars have permitted burial at night time. Ali Ibne Abi Talib buried his wife, Fatima at night, so that Abu Bakr may not pray her funeral prayer, since there was animosity between them.[5]

Ibne Abil Hadid, quoting from Jahiz (d. 255), has written:

> Complain and displeasure of Fatima (s) (at the hands of Abu Bakr and Umar) went to such limits that she made a will that Abu Bakr should not pray her funeral prayer.[6]

On another occasion, he writes:

> Concealing the demise and location of the burial of Fatima (s) and not reciting her funeral prayers by Abu Bakr and Umar and everyone whom Sayyid Murtaza has mentioned, is supported and accepted by me, because the reports regarding this are most authentic and numerous and in the same way, displeasure and anger of Fatima on Abu Bakr and Umar are more reliable in my view than other opinions.[7]

B. Cause of nocturnal burial in Shia reports

Since the cause of the bequest of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) is clear in view of Shia and there is consensus among Shia scholars regarding it, we would be content only to quote one authentic report about it.

The Late Shaykh Saduq has written in the reason of her nocturnal burial as follows:

> Ali bin Abi Hamza asked Imam Sadiq (a): Why Fatima (s) was buried at night and not during daytime? Imam (a) replied: Fatima (s) had made a bequest that she must be buried during the night, so that Abu Bakr and Umar may not pray on her bier.[8]

As a result of which, with attention to the present sources and admissions of prominent Ahle Sunnat scholars, the cause of nocturnal burial of Lady Fatima (s) was her bequest that she did not want those who had oppressed her to pray on her coffin.

NOTES

[1] http://forum.mosalman.net/showthread.php?t=13272

[2] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1549, Tr. no. 3998, Kitabul Maghazi, Chapter of Battle of Khyber, Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari Jofi, Abu Abdullah (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[3] *Tawil Mukhtalifil Hadith*, Vol. 1, Pg. 300, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah Al-Dainawari, (d. 276 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Zuhri al-Najjar, Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1393, 1972

[4] *Musannaf Abdur Razzaq*, Vol. 3, Pg. 521, tradition 6554, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[5] *Sharh Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 3, Pg. 325, Abdul Hasan Ali bin Khalaf bin Abdul Malik Ibne Battal Bakri Qurtubi (d. 449 A.H.), Edited: Abu Tamim Yasir bin Ibrahim, Maktabe Rushd – Saudia/Riyadh, 2nd Edition, 1423 A.H. – 2003 A.D.

[6] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 16, Pg. 157, Abu Hamid Izzuddin bin Hibatullah bin Muhammad bin Muhammad Ibne Abil Hadid Madaini Mutazali (d. 655 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Abdul Karim Namri, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut / Lebanon, First Edition, 1418 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[7] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 16, Pg. 170, Abu Hamid Izzuddin bin Hibatullah bin Muhammad bin Muhammad Ibne Abil Hadid Madaini Mutazali (d. 655 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Abdul Karim Namri, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut / Lebanon, First Edition, 1418 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[8] *Ilalush Sharai*, Vol. 1, Pg. 185, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ali bin Husain Saduq (d. 381 A.H.), Edited: Sayyid Muhammad Sadiq Bahrul Uloom, Manshurat Maktabal Haidariya wa Matbatha, Najaful Ashraf, 1385 – 1966 A.D.

OBJECTION 3:
ARAB MODESTY DOES NOT PERMIT OPPRESSION ON FATIMA (S)

EXPLANATION

One of the doubts, which tried to conceal the martyrdom of Fatima (s) is as follows:

With reference to the fact that basically Arab civilization more than any other community and nation, is more prominent as being chivalrous to women and is especially sensitive to their condition, how can it be accepted that Umar bin Khattab beat up a woman, and that also Lady Fatima Zahra (s), the beloved daughter of the Prophet and people having Arab chivalry did not display any reaction?!

RATIONAL REPLY

A. Burying alive of female children in the view of pre-Islamic Arabs

Can those who consider Arab chivalry to be an obstacle in attack on the house of revelation provide a convincing reply for the following verses of Quran and tell us where Arab chivalry was at the time of burying alive of female infants?

The Holy Quran has mentioned in the following way the defect of pre-Islamic Arabs in burying alive of female infants:

> "And when the female infant buried alive is asked. For what sin she was killed." (81:8-9)

Ibne Kathir Damishqi Wahabi has written in the interpretation of the above verse:

> Sometimes the people of pre-Islamic age, due to fear of poverty and livelihood killed their children...'Maudah'

is a female infant who is buried alive and it was the practice of pre-Islamic Arabs that in comparison to a son, a daughter was considered unlucky.[1]

B. Beating up and plundering the garments of ladies in Kerbala

Those who think that it was their manliness and chivalry, which prevented them from beating daughters and women, should see how during the bloody events of 61 A.H. in the incident of martyrdom of Imam Husain (a) at Kerbala, the daughters of the Messenger of Allah (s) were beaten up in the most merciless manner. Where was their chivalry gone?

Shaykh Saduq (r) writes, quoting from Fatima, daughter of Imam Husain (a):

> Fatima, daughter of Imam Husain (a) says: Plunderers surrounded our tents and I was a very young girl at that time and was wearing a gold anklet. A man snatched it away and began to cry. I said: O enemy of Allah, why do you cry? He replied: Why should I not cry when I am looting the daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s)? I said: Why don't you leave me alone? He replied: I fear that someone else would plunder your gold. She says: He looted everything present in our tents and even took away the *chador* (scarf) from our heads.[2]

C. Torture and killing of Sumayyah

If Arab chivalry had really been an obstacle in beating up of women, why Sumayyah, the mother was Ammar Yasir was not only beaten up, on the contrary, she was tortured so much that she achieved martyrdom? Ibne Hajar Asqalani has written in *Al-Isabah*:

> Sumayyah binte Khabbat...mother of Ammar Yasir was the seventh person to embrace Islam. Abu Jahl harassed her and stabbed her in the lower abdomen

with a spear till she was martyred. She was the first female martyr in Islam and since she had embraced Islam and did not give it up, the family of Bani Mughira tortured and harassed her till she was martyred.[3]

D. Enmity to ladies

On researching the life history of Umar bin Khattab, we discover that he did not, in any period of his life, put up good behavior to ladies, whether before embracing Islam or after it; and whether during his rule. Please note the following examples:

1. Beating up the sister

Some senior Ahle Sunnat scholars, including Shamsuddin Dhahabi in *Tarikhul Islam* and also Muhammad bin Saad in *Tabaqatul Kubra* and others have narrated that:

After Umar bin Khattab came to know that his sister and her husband have accepted Islam, he came to her house and beat up the husband. His sister intervened to save her husband. Umar fisted her in the face in such a way that it bled and got smeared in blood.[4]

2. Beating up Muslim women

Senior Ahle Sunnat scholars have mentioned the brutality and harassment of Umar on slave maids who had converted to Islam:

Abu Bakr had purchased a slave girl from Banu Muammal from the family of Adi bin Kaab, who had converted to Islam and whom Umar had beaten up so that she may recant her Islam and stop being a Muslim (since Umar was yet a polytheist). He beat her up till he was exhausted. He said: If you wonder why I stopped beating you, it is because I am exhausted, so please forgive me for that. The slave girl said: Know that the Almighty Allah would deal with you in the same manner.[5]

3. Beating up the mourning ladies in the presence of the Holy Prophet

Evidences exist that Umar bin Khattab, in the presence of the Holy Prophet (s), scolded Muslim ladies and beat them up on trivial pretexts.

Ahmad bin Hanbal has written in his *Musnad*:

> Zainab, the daughter of the Holy Prophet (s) passed away. The Prophet said: May the Almighty Allah join Zainab to Uthman bin Mazun, our righteous ancestor. Ladies began to weep on hearing this. Umar came with his customary whip and began to beat up the ladies in the very presence of the Holy Prophet (s) infuriating the Prophet of mercy. The Prophet took away the whip from Umar and said: Hold it! What have you got to do with these women? Let them weep. Then he said to them: You may continue to weep, but refrain from making satanic statements (sinful wails making allegations against the Almighty)...[6]

One who beats up Muslim women in such a blatant manner in the presence of the Holy Prophet (s), would he refrain from beating ladies during his own rule, and when the likes of Khalid bin Walid, Mughira bin Shoba, Qunfadh Adwi etc...are on his side?

Most probably the family members of the Holy Prophet (s) were among the ladies mourning for Zainab. One, who can raise objections to the ladies of the family of the Holy Prophet (s) in the very presence of the Prophet himself, what all would he not do when the Messenger of Allah (s) has passed away and when he is in power and on the seat of Caliphate; would he not act in such a blatant way?

4. Quarreling with regard to the wives of the Messenger of Allah (s)

One who, during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah (s) and in his presence, had been so blatant to scold and harass the wives of the Prophet and had been so adamant that they should remain in veil, till the angel of revelation descended and brought divine revelation opposed to the view of Umar; now, after the passing away of Prophet, what attitude he would have against one who opposed his rule or the rule of Abu Bakr?

Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari has mentioned three times in his book, on the authority of Ayesha, the story of the coming out of Sauda and that also in the darkness of the night and the angry attitude of Umar towards her and the revelation of the verse:

> Sauda (the wife of the Prophet) went out to answer the call of nature after it was made obligatory (for all Muslims ladies) to observe the veil. She was a fat huge lady, and everybody who knew her before could recognize her. So Umar bin Khattab saw her and said, "O Sauda! By Allah, you cannot hide yourself from us, so think of a way by which you should not be recognized on going out." Sauda returned while Allah's Apostle was in my house taking his supper and a bone covered with meat was in his hand. She entered and said, "O Allah's Apostle! I went out to answer the call of nature and Umar said to me so-and-so." Then Allah inspired him (the Prophet) and when the state of inspiration was over and the bone was still in his hand as he had not put in down, he said (to Sauda), "You (women) have been allowed to go out for your needs."[7]

Who permitted Umar to raise objections against the 'mothers of believers' and behave in such an insulting manner? Except that they were also helpless like other human beings and compelled to leave the house to fulfill some needs and

according to the text of tradition it was done on the permission of the Prophet of Islam (s).

5. Does chivalry lead one to be inimical?

It is remarkable that some Ahle Sunnat scholars have narrated this harassment of mother of believers, Sauda at the hands of Umar as one of his excellence.

Alusi, the famous Wahabi commentator of Quran, has written about this:

> Shia condemn Umar with regard to that which occurred between him and mother of believers, Sauda; and they consider it to be a defect of Umar and they regard this to be disrespect to the family of the Prophet, insult of his wives and harassment to them: whereas Ahle Sunnat have replied: Supposing the report is true, Umar considered that act good and a cause of blessing.[8]

6. Miscarriage due to fear

Umar bin Khattab, during the period of his Caliphate also, displayed so much enmity to ladies that if he summoned a Muslim lady, she used to be so terrified that she even suffered miscarriage.

Abdur Razzaq Sanani, teacher of Bukhari, has written in his book of *Musannaf*:

> Umar summoned a lady, who was reported to be visited (by men). When that lady heard this, she denied it and wailed: Woe be on me, what do I have to do with Umar? On the way, she experienced labor pains and entered a house and delivered the fetus there. Two cries were heard from the child and then it died.[9]

So clear was this matter in the view of Ahle Sunnat scholars that they have confirmed this in their reliable jurisprudence

books. Mohiuddin Nawawi has, in his book of jurisprudence, *Al-Majmua*, written:

> Part: If a woman speaks ill in the presence of the ruler and she makes allegations against him, the ruler may send someone to her to summon her and if that woman suffers a miscarriage due the fear of the ruler; it is obligatory on the ruler to pay the blood money of the aborted child; because it is reported that Umar was informed: there is a woman whom men visit. Umar sent someone to summon that woman. When she heard this, she said: What do I have to do with Umar? On the way, she experienced labor pains due to fear and delivered her fetus. Two cries were heard from the child and then it died...[10]

Also, Ibne Qudama Muqaddasi, the famous jurisprudent of Hanbali sect has written:

> If a ruler summons a woman and she has a miscarriage, the ruler is responsible for it. This command is there, because Umar ordered his men to summon a woman about whom it was reported that men visited her. When she came to know about this, she said: O woe, what do I have to do with Umar? On way to Umar she experienced labor pains due to apprehension and delivered her fetus. Two cries were heard from the child and then it died...[11]

The same matter is also mentioned in *Kitabul Kafi* under the jurisprudence of Ibne Hanbal.[12]

7. Urination of women due to fear

Abdur Razzaq Sanani, teacher of Bukhari, has written in his book of *Musannaf*:

> Umar passed through ranks of ladies and detected fragrance from one of them and said: If I come to

know, which of the women has used perfume, I would do this and that to her. You women should perfume yourself for your husbands and when you come out, you should put on old clothes. The narrator says: I heard that the woman who had used perfume made water in her clothes due to fear.[13]

8. Beating up of the ladies who had gathered in the house of Ummul Momineen Maimuna

Teacher of Bukhari, Abdur Razzaq Sanani, has written in another place in his book of *Musannaf*:

When Khalid bin Walid died (during the period of Umar), women gathered in the house of Maimoona, wife of the Prophet and started mourning for him. Umar came out with his usual whip with Ibne Abbas and said to him: O Abu Abdullah, go to Ummul Momineen Maimuna and order her to put on the veil and bring to me the ladies who have gathered in her house. Ibne Abbas says: Women came out of the house and Umar whipped them. As Umar whipped, the covering of one of them opened. They said to Umar: Her covering has opened up, leave her alone. Umar remarked: What have you got to do with her? They are absolutely shameless.[14]

9. Entering the house at night and beating up of women

Abdur Razzaq Sanani has written in another place in his book:

One night Umar bin Khattab heard wails and screams. He went after the sound and entered the house from which the scream had emerged. He dispersed the women and himself went to the lady who was wailing and began to whip her. During this, the veil of lady was exposed. They said to Umar: Her veil is exposed. He replied: Such a woman is having no respect.[15]

Does the Muslim ruler have right to enter the house of people without permission; whereas the Almighty Allah says:

> "O you who believe! Do not enter houses other than your own houses until you have asked permission and saluted their inmates; this is better for you, that you may be mindful. But if you do not find any one therein, then do not enter them until permission is given to you; and if it is said to you: Go back, then go back; this is purer for you; and Allah is Cognizant of what you do." (24:27-28)

10. Attack on the house of Ayesha

Numairi has mentioned in *Tarikhul Medina* and Tabari has written in his *Tarikh* that:

> Saeed bin Musayyab narrated that Abu Bakr died and Ayesha began to weep and wail for him. Umar came to the door of Ayesha and prohibited the ladies from weeping and wailing, but they paid no attention to him. Umar ordered Hisham bin Walid to enter the house and bring out the sister of Abu Bakr. When Ayesha heard this from Umar, she said to Hisham: I, in my house am more eligible to do what I like. Umar said to Hisham: I permit you to enter the house. Hisham entered the house and brought out Umme Farwa, sister of Abu Bakr and took her to Umar. Umar started waving the whip and lashed her a few times. When the women heard about this they dispersed from there.[16]

11. Beating up the sister of Abu Bakr

Ibne Saad has written in *Tabaqatul Kubra* and Ibne Athir has stated in his *Tarikh* that:

> It is narrated from Saeed bin Musayyab: When Abu Bakr died, Ayesha held a condolence meeting. Umar heard about it and prohibited the ladies from weeping

and wailing, but they paid no attention to him. Umar said to Hisham bin Walid: Bring the daughter of Abu Qahafa (sister of Abu Bakr) to me. When Umme Farwa arrived, he gave her lashes. The ladies, who had gathered to mourn the deceased, on coming to know about this, dispersed from there.[17]

As a result, through a brief survey of the life, personality and manners of Umar, it can be concluded that with reference to his past, his behavior and his whole set up, attack on the house of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) is only one of the tens of instances recorded in pages of history about his beating up of women, which are proved authentic through solid evidences and supported and certified in books of Ahle Sunnat.

NOTES

[1] *Tafsir Quranil Azeem*, Vol. 2, Pg. 181, & Vol. 4, Pg. 478, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Abul Fida Qarshi Damishqi (d. 774), Darul Fikr – Beirut – 1401 A.H.

[2] *Al-Amali*, Pg. 229, Abu Ja'far Muslim bin Ali bin Husain Saduq (d. 381 A.H.), Edited and published: Qism Darasatul Islamiya – Mausasil Batha, Markaz Taba-at wan Nashar fee Mausasil Batha, First edition, 1417 A.H.

[3] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 7, Pg. 712, no. 11342, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei. Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[4] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 3, Pg. 386, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.).

Al-Ahadithul Mukhtara, Vol. 7, Pg. 141, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Abdul Wahid bin Ahmad Muqaddasi Hanbali (d. 643), Edited: Abdul Malik bin Abdullah bin Dahish, Maktaba Nahzatul Haditha, Mecca Mukarrama – First edition, 1410 A.H.

Tarikhul Islam wa Wafayatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 1, Pg. 174, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri, Darul Kitabul Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition

Al-Matalibul Aaliya ba Zawaidul Masanid al-Thamaniya, Vol. 17, Pg. 259, Ibne Hajar Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Saad bin Nasir bin Abdul Aziz Shustari, Darul Asima/Darul Ghayth – Saudia, First edition, 1419 A.H.

Ibne Kathir Damishqi has also narrated as follows:

Fatima binte Khattab came forward to defend her husband. Umar hit her in such a way that her head was fractured.

Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya, Vol. 3, Pg. 80, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Abul Fida Qarashi Damishqi (d. 774 A.H.), Maktabul Marif – Beirut.

[5] *Seerat Nabawiyyah*, Vol. 2, Pg. 161, Abdul Malik bin Hisham bin Ayyub Abu Muhammad Himyari Mafiri (d. 213 A.H.), Edited: Taha Abdul Rauf Saad, Darul Jeel, First edition, 1411 A.H.

Fadailus Sahaba, Vol. 1, Pg. 120, Ahmad bin Hanbal Abu Abdullah Shaibani (d. 241 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Wasiullah Muhammad Abbas,

Mausasatur Risala – Beirut, First edition, 1403 A.H. – 1983 A.D.

[6] *Musnad Ahmad Hanbal*, Vol. 1, Pg. 237, Ahmad bin Hanbal Abu Abdullah Shaibani (d. 241 A.H.), Mausasatur Qurtuba – Egypt.

Mustadrak Alas Sahihain, Vol. 3, Pg. 210, Muhammad bin Abdullah Abu Abdullah Hakim Nishapuri (d. 405 A.H.), Edited: Mustafa Abdul Qadir Ata, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut, First edition, 1411 A.H. – 1990 A.D.

Neelal Autar min Ahadith Sayyidul Akhyar Sharh Muttaqiul Akhbar, Vol. 4, Pg. 149, Muhammad bin Ali bin Muhammad Shaukani (d. 1255 A.H.). Darul Jeel, Beirut – 1973;

Tohfatul Ahuzi Basharh Jamiul Tirmidhi, Vol. 4, Pg. 75, Muhammad Abdur Rahman bin Abdur Rahim Abul Alaa Mabar Kafoori (d. 1353 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut.

[7] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 67, Tr. no. 146, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Kitabul Wudhu, Chapter of the coming out of women for answering Nature's call, and Vol. 4, Pg. 1780, Tr. 4479, Kitabut Tafsir, Chapter:"*do not enter the houses of the Prophet unless permission is given to you*" and Vol. 4, Pg. 1800, Tr. 4517 and Kitabun Nikah, Chapter of coming out of women for answering Nature's call, Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[8] *Ruhul Maani fee Tafsirul Quranul Azeem wa Saba-al Mathani*, Vol. 22, Pg. 72, Allamah Abul Fazl Shahabuddin, Sayyid Mahmudul Alusi Baghdadi (d. 1270 A.H.), Dar Ahya Turathul Arabi – Beirut.

[9] *Musannaf*, Vol. 9, Pg. 458, Tr. 18010, Chapter of those who are terrified of the ruler, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211 A.H.), Edited: Habibur Rahman Azami, Maktabal Islami – Beirut, Second edition, 1403 A.H.

[10] *Al-Majmua*, Vol. 19, Pg. 12, Abu Zakariya Muhiuddin Nawawi (d. 676 A.H.), Darul Fikr Lit Taba wan Nashar wat Tauzih, Supplement no. 2.

[11] *Al-Mughni fee Fiqhatul Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal Shaibani*, Vol. 1, Pg. 338, Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Qudama Abu Muhammad Muqaddasi (d. 623 A.H.), Darul Fikr – Beirut, First edition, 1405 A.H.

[12] *Al-Kafi fee Fiqh al-Imamil Mabjal Ahmad bin Hanbal*, Vol. 4, Pg. 60, Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Qudama Abu Muhammad Muqaddasi (d. 623 A.H.), Maktabul Islami – Beirut.

[13] *Musannaf*, Vol. 4, Pg. 374, Tr. 8117, Chapter of those who are terrified of the ruler, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211 A.H.), Edited: Habibur Rahman Azami, Maktabal Islami – Beirut, Second edition, 1403 A.H.

[14] *Musannaf*, Vol. 3, Pg. 557, Tr. 6681, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211 A.H.), Edited: Habibur Rahman Azami, Maktabal Islami – Beirut, Second edition, 1403 A.H.

[15] *Musannaf*, Vol. 3, Pg. 557, Tr. 6682, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211 A.H.), Edited: Habibur Rahman Azami, Maktabal Islami – Beirut, Second edition, 1403 A.H.

[16] *Tarikhul Medina Munawwara*, Vol. 1, Pg. 358, Abu Zaid Umar bin Shabatul Numairi Basri (d. 262 A.H.), Edited: Ali Muhammad Dandal and Yasin Saduddin Bayan, Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut – 1417 A.H. – 1996 A.D.

Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 350, Tabari, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir (d. 310), Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut.

[17] *Tabaqatul Kubra*, Vol. 3, Pg. 208, Muhammad bin Saad bin Mani Abu Abdullah Basri Zuhri (d. 230 A.H.), Dar Sadir – Beirut;

Al-Kamil fit Tarikh, Vol. 2, Pg. 267, Izzuddin bin Athir Abul Hasan Ali bin Muhammad Jazari (d. 630 A.H.), Edited: Abdullah Qadi, Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut, Second edition, 1415 A.H.

OBJECTION 4:
REPORT OF 'FATIMA IS A PART OF ME' WAS REGARDING PROPOSAL OF ALI (A) TO THE DAUGHTER OF ABU JAHL

EXPLANATION

In one of their objections, the Wahabis have mentioned:

We have numerous authentic traditional reports, which mention the proposal of Ali (r) to Juwairiya, Abu Jahl's daughter, which say that when Fatima (r) was yet alive, Ali (r) sent a proposal to Abu Jahl's daughter. When Fatima came to know about this, she was extremely distraught and the Holy Prophet (s) also, after coming to know about it, came to the Masjid and said: "Fatima is a part of me; one, who has hurt her, has in fact hurt me."

In spite of these traditional reports, why do the Shia try to use this report as condemnation of Abu Bakr and Umar, whereas the Prophet was himself infuriated and displeased with his son-in-law – Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) – may Allah honor his countenance – and he mentioned the captioned tradition?

RATIONAL REPLY

The true source of the fiction of the marriage proposal of Amirul Momineen (a) to Abu Jahl's daughter, Juwairiya, is the traditional report, which Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari has mentioned in a number of places in his *Sahih*. First, we would quote the original version and then analyze it:

When they (caravan of Ahle Bayt) reached Medina after returning from (captivity in Shaam with) Yazid bin Muawiyah after the martyrdom of Husain bin Ali (may Allah bestow His Mercy upon him), Al-Miswar bin Makhrama met him and

asked, "Do you have any need you may order me to satisfy?" Ali said, "No." Al-Miswar asked, "Will you give me the sword of Allah's Apostle for I am afraid that people may take it from you by force? By Allah, if you give it to me, they will never be able to take it till I die. [till Makhrama said in the due course] When Ali bin Abi Talib asked for the hand of Abi Jahl's daughter to be his wife besides Fatima, I heard Allah's Apostle on his pulpit delivering a sermon in this connection before the people, and I had then attained puberty. Allah's Apostle said: Fatima is from me, and I am afraid she will be subjected to trials in her religion (because of jealousy). The Prophet then mentioned one of his sons-in-law from the tribe of Abu Shams, and praised him as a good son-in-law, saying: Whatever he said was the truth, and he promised me and fulfilled his promise. I do not make a legal thing illegal, nor do I make an illegal thing legal, but by Allah, the daughter of Allah's Apostle and the daughter of the enemy of Allah, (i.e. Abu Jahl) can never get together (as the wives of one man)."[1]

Bukhari has written, on another occasion in his book:

> Narrated Al-Miswar bin Makhrama: Ali asked for the hand of Abu Jahl's daughter. Fatima heard of this and went to Allah's Apostle saying, "Your people think that you do not become angry for the sake of your daughters as Ali is now going to marry Abu Jahl's daughter. "On that Allah's Apostle got up and after his recitation of Tashahud. I heard him saying, "Then after! I married one of my daughters to Abul Aas bin Rabi (the husband of Zainab, the daughter of Prophet) before Islam and he proved truthful in whatever he said to me. No doubt, Fatima is a part of me; I hate to see her being troubled. By Allah, the daughter of Allah's Apostle and the daughter of Allah's enemy cannot be wives of one man." So Ali gave up that engagement.[2]

Although other traditional reports also exist in this regard in Ahle Sunnat books of traditions, but since Bukhari is considered to be the most important traditional book of Ahle Sunnat, we have analyzed the reports of this book. Without any doubt, if the suggestions of these reports are clarified the implication of the rest of them would also become clear.

A. Viewpoint of Ahle Bayt (a) regarding this fiction

Before the analysis of Bukhari, it is appropriate to state the viewpoint of Ahle Bayt (a) regarding this fiction.

Shaykh Saduq (r) has, in his *Amali*, narrated from Imam Sadiq (a) a detailed report concerning this:

> Al-Qama says: I asked Imam Sadiq (a): O son of the Messenger of Allah (s), people (Ahle Sunnat) accuse us (Shia) of committing vile acts; in such a way that it has made us extremely distressed. Imam (a) said: O Al-Qama, man cannot invite the attention of people and bridle their tongues. How can you remain safe from that from which the prophets, messengers and successors had not remained safe? Did they not accuse Yusuf of having intention to commit fornication? Did they not say about Ayyub (a) that he was involved in those calamities due to his sins? Did they not say about Prophet Dawood (a) that he pursued the bird till he glanced at the wife of Uriya for a moment and became infatuated with her; and in order to achieve his aim, he sent the husband of that woman to the battlefront and placed him before the Ark of Covenant till he was killed and after that he married her?... Did they not accuse the Messenger of Allah (s) of being partial to his cousin, Ali (a) and that he spoke under the influence of his selfish desires...and they have said more than this regarding his successors...Did they not allege that the chief of successors, Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) wanted to

> marry Abu Jahl's daughter while having Fatima as a wife? And that the Prophet in the presence of Muslims ascended the pulpit and complained about him saying: O people, Ali wants to bring the daughter of the enemy of God upon the head of the daughter of the Messenger of Allah. Know that Fatima is a part of me; one, who has hurt her, has in fact hurt me and one who has pleased her has in fact pleased me and whoever has infuriated her has in fact made me furious....[3]

B. Miswar bin Makhrama was inimical to Ahle Bayt (a)

All these the reports, which Ahle Sunnat have recorded, especially in *Sahih Bukhari* and *Muslim*, are on the authority of a person named Miswar bin Makhrama, a devotee of Abdullah bin Zubair. He was a member of Ibne Zubair's army. During Yazid's attack on Holy Mecca, he shot rocks from catapults on Yazid's army; he was killed along with a number of people.

Abdullah bin Zubair was among the enemies of Ahle Bayt (a). So much so that he omitted the recitation of Salawat[4], because the Ahle Bayt (a) of the Prophet were also included in it. Balazari writes in *Ansabul Ashraf*:

> Among the vile acts of Abdullah Ibne Zubair was not mentioning the name of the Messenger of Allah (s) in his sermons. When he was asked about this, he said: Some relatives of the Messenger of Allah (s) were evil human beings; they become arrogant, pleased and conceited by hearing his name.[5]

In order to prove the enmity of Miswar bin Makhrama to Ahle Bayt (a) it is sufficient to say that Khawarij had very good relations with them and they considered him as one of their own. Dhahabi has written in the biography of Miswar bin Makhrama:

> Khawarij have adopted him and they consider him as one of their own.[6]

In the same way, he was a supporter of Muawiyah to such an extent that whenever he heard the name of Muawiyah, he used to invoke blessing on him (recite *Durood*). Dhahabi has written about this in *Seer Aalamun Nubla*:

> I never saw Miswar hearing the name of Muawiyah without invoking divine blessings for him.[7]

In spite of all this, is it all right to accept the reports of this character about Ahle Bayt (a)?

It is interesting that according to Bukhari, Miswar bin Makhrama has mentioned this in the presence of Imam Sajjad (a) when he had just returned from Shaam and was shattered by the martyrdom of his father and brothers. At a time when Imam Zainul Abideen (a) was in need of condolence and comforting, would any sane person, except an enemy of Ahle Bayt (a) would permit himself to utter these statements and break the heart of the Holy Imam (a)?

C. The sole reporter of this tradition, Miswar bin Makhrama reached puberty at the age of six

It is very interesting and remarkable to look at the condition of Ahle Sunnat narrators on the basis of what their own scholars of science of narrators have said.

Miswar bin Makhrama was born in 2 A.H. in Mecca and in 8 A.H. he migrated to Medina. On the other hand they have narrated that the incident of proposing to the daughter of Abu Jahl occurred in 8 A.H.; that was when Miswar bin Makhrama was not more than six years of age.

Ibne Hajar Asqalani has written in *Al-Isabah*:

> Miswar was born two years after migration (*Hijrat*) and he entered Medina after the conquest of Mecca during the month of Zilhajj in 8 A.H. and he was not more than six years old.[8]

In the same way, there are two other points in the report of Miswar, which if examined carefully will fully expose the falsity of this fiction and they are as follows:

A. In the report of Bukhari. it is mentioned that Miswar says: I heard about this incident when I had reached puberty.[9]

Now, our question is: When the age of puberty is around fifteen years, how is it possible for a six year old boy to reach puberty?

Ibne Hajar Asqalani noted this basic difficulty, but as per his usual habit has overlooked it and justified it in the following way that: It is possible that 'reaching puberty' is in the literal sense; that is mental maturity.

He has written concerning this in *Tahdhibut Tahdhib*:

> There is doubt in the chain of narrators and sources of this quotation, because there is no difference of opinion regarding the fact that Miswar was born after migration (*Hijrat*) and the incident of proposing to the daughter of Abu Jahl occurred after six or seven years after the birth of Miswar, thus, how he could have reached sexual maturity; although it is possible that 'reaching puberty' is in the literal sense, that is becoming mentally matured.[10]

In reply it should be said:

Firstly: This justification is against rules of Arabic grammar and general parlance and no sane person would accept this explanation;

Secondly: Supposing that 'reaching puberty' in the literal sense means reaching mental puberty, even then this justification is not applicable to Miswar bin Makhrama, because according to the report of *Sahih Muslim*, when he was

present in Medina, he was absolutely ignorant of the fundamentals of religion, so much so that he did not conceal his privates from people and even the Messenger of Allah (s); and came out without clothes. From this aspect how is it possible to accept that he reached mental maturity at the age of six?

Miswar says:

> I was carrying a heavy stone and my lower garment was loose, and it, therefore, slipped off (so soon) that I could not place the stone (on the ground) and carry to its proper place. Upon this the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: Return to your cloth (lower garment), take it (and tie it around your waist) and do not walk naked.[11]

D. Miswar bin Makhrama is the sole witness of this incident

It is interesting that among all those companions only this six year old child heard the Prophet and quoted him. It is not clear why the rest of the companions of the Prophet while being present in the Majid did not hear this story and did not narrate it?

E. Refuting this fiction through the verses of Quran

In addition to the very difficult problems that are mentioned above, when this tradition is posed before the criterion of the Holy Quran, it is found wanting in that case also. It becomes clear that it is in no way compatible to the teachings of Quran; because Quran has clearly issued permission for men to practice polygamy and it has declared:

> "...then marry such women as seem good to you, two and three and four." (4:3)

And we see that the Messenger of Allah (s) has followed this practice; also in fact he was the practical demonstration of this

divine command, whereas the topic of the report of Miswar bin Makhrama is that the Messenger of Allah (s) has considered it unlawful for Ali (a), his son-in-law to choose a second wife.

Can the Messenger of Allah (s) make something, which the Almighty Allah has allowed, to be unlawful?

Also, there are many other fundamental doubts, like:

1. Juwairiya had not accepted Islam till that time.
2. Juwairiya considered her father, a prophet.
3. Juwairiya was inimical to Amirul Momineen (a) as he had eliminated her father.

For the sake of brevity, we abstain from going into details.

Now, with reference to the deep malice of Juwairiya to the killer of her father and other points, which are mentioned about her, can it be imagined that she would have liked to become the wife of the killer of her father or that Amirul Momineen (a) would have liked to propose to a woman like Juwairiya?

POLEMICAL REPLY: WHY UTHMAN MARRIED THE DAUGHTER OF THE PROPHET AND DAUGHTER OF THE ENEMY OF GOD AT THE SAME TIME?

Even if we overlook all the points mentioned above, which were rational rebuttals of Wahabis, and state the polemical reply as well, it should be said:

In the report of Bukhari, regarding the proposal of Amirul Momineen (a), it is mentioned that:

> The Messenger of Allah (s) says: I do not make a legal thing illegal, nor do I make an illegal thing legal, but by Allah, the daughter of Allah's Apostle and the daughter of the enemy of Allah, (i.e. Abu Jahl) can never get together (as the wives of one man).[12]

This is in the condition that the fabricator has forgotten that by fabricating this fiction, before insulting Amirul Momineen (a) he has put Uthman bin Affan, the third Caliph of Ahle Sunnat under question, because he had after marrying the daughters of the Prophet (suppose we accept that they were daughters of Prophet), not once, but a number of times married daughters of the enemies of Allah at the same time.

If it was really unlawful to marry daughters of the Prophet and daughters of enemies of Allah, how Uthman bin Affan committed this act a number of times? Did the fabricators of this fiction fulfill the conditions of this fiction? Since Ramla binte Shaybah is one of the wives of Uthman whom he married in Mecca and she was of those who moved to Medina with Uthman. Ibne Abde Barr has written concerning this:

Ramla, daughter of Shaybah was of those who moved to Medina with their husband, Uthman.[13]

And Shaybah, father of Uthman's wife was an enemy of the Prophet of Islam (s); he was killed during the Battle of Badr, as Ibne Hajar has written concerning this:

> Ramla, daughter of Shaybah...her father was killed during the Battle of Badr while he was an idolater.[14]

On the other hand, Ramla, at the time of migration to Medina, was the wife of Uthman as Ibne Hajar has mentioned further:

> Abu Umar has mentioned her account and said: She was an emigrant lady who migrated to Medina with her husband, Uthman.[15]

And she was the wife of Uthman till his assassination as Shaibani has written in this regard:

> Uthman was assassinated while Ramla, daughter of Shaybah, was his wife.[16]

If in fact marrying the Prophet's daughter and daughter of Allah's enemy had been prohibited, why the Holy Prophet (s) did not prohibit this act? And according to the claims of Ahle Sunnat, the Holy Prophet (s) married his two daughters, one after another, to Uthman?

Wahabis would be compelled to either accept that the story of proposing to Abu Jahl's daughter is basically false or accept that Prophet's daughters were not married to Uthman or accept that Uthman committed a sinful act and in fact marriage of Prophet's daughters to Uthman was unlawful and the marriage of Uthman to them was unlawful.

In addition to the above doubts, this fiction more than that it should insult the status of Amirul Momineen (a) is insulting to the position of the Messenger of Allah (s), because as mentioned before, polygamy is lawful for all Muslim men subject to special conditions, and they can have four permanent wives at a time, but according to this fiction, the Messenger of Allah (s), in spite of the fact that the Almighty Allah considers him to be the supreme model of good morals, should be so partial to come to the Masjid dragging his cloak on the ground and say with absolute partiality: If Ali wants to marry Abu Jahl's daughter, he should divorce my daughter!

As a result of this, with reference to that which is mentioned so far, it has become very clear that the proposal of Amirul Momineen (a) to Abu Jahl's daughter is a fiction, which Bani Umayyah have fabricated to make the Caliphs share in crimes; that by fabricating these fictions, they wanted to imply that if Umar and Abu Bakr distressed Fatima Zahra (s), Amirul Momineen (a) has also committed this act.

NOTES

[1] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1132, Tr. no. 2443, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[2] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1364, Tr. no. 3523, Kitab Fadailus Sahaba, Chapter 16: Chapter of sons-in-law of the Holy Prophet (s), including Abul Aas bin Rabi, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[3] *Al-Amali*, Pg. 165, Abu Ja'far Muslim bin Ali bin Husain Saduq (d. 381 A.H.), Edited and published: Qism Darasatul Islamiya – Mausasil Batha, Markaz Taba-at wan Nashar fee Mausasil Batha, First edition, 1417 A.H.

[4] O God, please bless Muhammad and the progeny of Muhammad (*Allaahumma S'alli A'laa Muh'ammadinw wa Aaali Muh'ammad*)

[5] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 2, Pg. 418, Al-Balazari, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir (d. 279 A.H.).

[6] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 3, Pg. 391, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman al-Dhahabi, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[7] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 3, Pg. 392, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman al-Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[8] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 6, Pg. 119, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[9] "I heard Allah's Apostle on his pulpit delivering a sermon in this connection before the people, and I had then attained my age of puberty."

[10] *Tahdhibut Tahdhib*, Vol. 10, Pg. 137, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fadhl Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1404 – 1984 A.D., First edition.

[11] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 1, Pg. 268, Tr. no. 341, Kitabul Haid, Baab Itniya Bihifzil Awra, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[12] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1132, Tr. no. 2443, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[13] *Al-Istiab fee Marifatul Ashab*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1846, Yusuf bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abde Barr (d. 463), Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1412, First edition, Edited: Ali Muhammad al-Bajawi.

[14] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 7, Pg. 654, no. 11186, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[15] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 7, Pg. 654, no. 11186, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[16] *Al-Kamil fit Tarikh*, Abul Hasan Ali bin Abil Karam Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Abdul Karim Shaibani (d. 630 A.H.), Vol. 3, Pg. 75, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut – 1415 A.H. Second edition, Edited: Abdullah Qadi.

SECONDARY OBJECTION 5

A. Rejection or acceptance of the tradition of 'Fatima is a part of me'

You Shia by opposing a part of this traditional report have in fact decided to prove this true tradition to be weak and consider the whole of it to be fabricated. Even that part, which says: Fatima is a part of me, whoever has hurt her, has hurt me, thus, you must not accept such report or accept the whole of it, since if this tradition is true, all of it is correct and if not, the whole of it is untrue.

Reply

As we mentioned a number times, our reasoning through the reports of Ahle Sunnat is according to the rule of necessity,[1] and if not, without any doubt, we consider this report of Bukhari like many of his reports as fabrications of Bani Umayyah and basically consider them false.

Among the evidences of the falsity of the above report are other traditions, which Bukhari has mentioned in other places in his book and in which the subject of marriage proposal is not mentioned. Bukhari has mentioned in another place in his book:

> The Messenger of Allah (s) said: Fatima is a part of me; one who infuriates her has made me furious.[2]

NOTES

[1] Refer to footnote in the preamble of this book in explanation of the rule of obligation (*Ilzam*). In the same way, you can refer to more points in this regard in our book: *Adaab Manazira ba Wahabiyat*, Pg. 225 etc.

[2] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1361, Tr. no. 3510, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama – Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

SECONDARY OBJECTION 6

B. The same story in Shia sources

Shia, who try to justify the report of *Sahih Bukhari* on the subject of proposal of Ali (a) for Juwairiya have overlooked the fact that the same report is mentioned in books of Shia as well.

Reply

A. Firstly, the consensus of Shia scholars in denying this subject and considering it to be false is the best proof of refutation of this attribution.

B. This report, in some Shia books is like one, which was quoted a little while ago under the explanation of 'viewpoint of Ahle Bayt (a) regarding this fiction', but it was propagated to make allegation about Amirul Momineen (a) and it was refuted in the same report. A similar tradition mentioned at the beginning of doubt no. 2, under the topic of 'viewpoint of Ahle Bayt (a) regarding this fiction' was quoted from the book of *Amali* of Shaykh Saduq.

C. If in some Shia books this report is also mentioned and not refuted, it has come with incomplete, weak and unacceptable chains of narrators, as this report is weak from two aspects:

1. The account of the narrator is unknown: Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Yahya bin Zakariya Qattan. Just as the Late Mamqani has mentioned about him in his book of *Rijal*:

> With regard to Abu Abbas, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Zakariya Qattan who is also mentioned in the chain of narrators of Shaykh Saduq in *Man Laa Yahzarahul Faqih* and was previously mentioned under the explanation of the topic of Ahmad bin Hasan, is an unknown personality and his name is not mentioned in any book of *Rijal* (science of narrators).[1]

2. Serious omission:

A serious omission is seen in reports narrated with this chain of narrators, because Amr bin Abil Miqdam, who was a companion of Imam Baqir and Imam Sadiq (a) and he passed away in 172 A.H. in reports from these two Imams he is placed in the first category. Between him and Shaykh Saduq (r) five levels of reporters exist.

For example with the chains that Shaykh Saduq (r) has mentioned in his book of *Amali* in the usual way on the authority of Amr bin Abi Miqdam from Imam Baqir (a), please note:

> Narrated to us Husain bin Ahmad bin Idris (r) that he said: Narrated to us my father from Muhammad bin Husain bin Abil Khattab from Muhammad bin Abi Umair from Ja'far Azdi from Amr bin Abil Miqdam that he said: I heard Abu Ja'far, Imam Baqir (a) say:...[2]

As you can see, in the chain of narrators of this tradition, between Shaykh Saduq who is the writer of this book and Amr bin Abil Miqdam, there is a gap of five levels of narrators whose reporters are as follows:

1. Husain bin Ahmad bin Idris 2. His father, Ahmad bin Idris 3. Muhammad bin Husain bin Abil Khattab 4. Muhammad bin Abi Umair 5. Ja'far Azdi.

Whereas in the tradition under discussion between Shaykh Saduq and Amr bin Abil Miqdam, there is only a gap of two levels, whose reporters are as follows: 1. Ali bin Ahmad 2. Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Yahya; that is there are three levels of reporters in the report under discussion. That is why this report is absolutely *Mursal* (having incomplete chain of narrators) and unfit to be reasoned with.

NOTES

[1] *Tanqihul Maqal fee Ahwalur Rijal* (3 vols.), Abdullah Mamqani, Vol. 1, Pg. 101, Chapter of Ahmad.

[2] *Al-Amali*, Shaykh Saduq, Pg. 158

OBJECTION 7:
IF FATIMA (S) WAS ATTACKED WHY ALI (A) DID NOT DEFEND HER?

Explanation

Among the most important doubts, which Wahabis propagate to instigate the feelings of people with an aim to deny attack on the house of revelation is that if such an attack ever took place, why Amirul Momineen (a) did not defend his wife? Was he not the victorious lion of Allah and the most valiant person of his time? Ali, who was the victorious lion of Allah and who possessed the enemy-routing sword and a hand with which he raised the gate of Fort Khyber, how even after having so much strength he saw his spouse being beaten up in his presence, but did not display any reaction? And...

Rational reply

Throughout history, Shia scholars have given various replies to this objection, which we shall briefly state in few points as follows:

A. Amirul Momineen (a) defended

Amirul Momineen (a), in the first stage and when his house took the shape of confrontation, displayed severe reaction and confronted the attackers, including Umar. He seized his collar, threw him down and fisted his neck and face; but since the Imam was commanded patience, he refrained from continuing the dispute and according to the command of the Messenger of Allah (s), he observed patience.

Amirul Momineen (a) in fact, wanted Umar and his other companions to understand that if he had not been ordered to observe patience and if the order of the Almighty Allah had been to the contrary, no one would have dared to attack the

house of Fatima (s) and give way to their imagination; but the Imam, like always, was obedient to the command of the Almighty Allah.

Sulaym bin Qays Hilali, a sincere companion of Amirul Momineen (a), has written regarding this:

> Umar asked for fire and ignited it at the door of the house and the door broke. He opened it and entered. Lady Zahra (s) came to him and screamed: O father, O Messenger of Allah (s)! Umar raised the sword while it was in its cover and hit at the side of Fatima. Fatima called out again: O father! Umar raised the whip and hit at the side of Fatima. She called out again: O Messenger of Allah (s)! See how Abu Bakr and Umar are behaving with your survivors! Ali (a) stood up all of a sudden and seized the collar of Umar and pulled him down so hard that he fell down. Then he fisted him at his nose and neck and wanted to eliminate him, but he remembered the statement of the Prophet and the bequest he had made to him and he stood up and said: O son of Sahhak, by the one who sent Muhammad as a Prophet, if divine will and covenant of the Prophet had not been there on my neck, you would have known that you would not have been able to enter my house.[1]

In the same way, Alusi, the well known Wahabi commentator, quoting Shia sources has narrated this report:

> Umar became infuriated and burnt down the door of the house of Ali (a) and entered the house. Fatima (s) came to Umar and screamed: O my father, O Messenger of Allah (s)! Umar raised the sword while it was in its cover and hit at the side of Fatima. Then Umar raised the whip and hit at the side of Fatima. Fatima called out again: O father! Seeing this, Ali (a) suddenly arose and seized Umar's collar, jerked it hard and threw him down and hit at his nose and neck.[2]

B. Ali (a) surrendered only due to the bequest of the Holy Prophet (s)

Throughout his life, Amirul Momineen (a) was obedient to the commands of the Almighty Allah and only divine orders made him react; and prejudice, anger and selfish motives never made him act in response.

His Eminence was commanded by the Almighty Allah and the Holy Prophet (s) to observe patience and forbearance before great calamities and it was according to this command that he was not supposed to take up arms.

The Late Raziuddin Musawi in his book, *Khasaisul Aaimma* has written:

> Imam Kazim (a) says that he asked his father, Imam Sadiq (a): What happened after the Messenger of Allah (s) swooned? My father replied: Ladies entered and started wailing. Muhajireen and Ansar gathered and expressed sorrow and grief. Ali (a) said: Suddenly they called me; I entered and threw myself on the body of the Messenger of Allah (s). He said: My brother, these people would abandon me and become engrossed in their worldly activities, but all this should not prevent you from attending to me. Your simile in my Ummah is like the simile of Kaaba that the Almighty Allah has made it a sign so that they may come to it from far off places...when I am no more and when you have concluded what I have willed you to do and you have placed my body in my grave, sit at home and compile the Quran as I have ordered, on the basis of obligatory acts, laws and sequence of revelation. I advise you to observe patience in what befalls you and Fatima at the hands of these people. Make patience your habit till you meet me.[3]

Yes, at one time the command of the Almighty Allah was that enemies should not get sleep due to the fear of his Zulfiqar

and at another time the command was that this same Zulfiqar should remain in its case so that the foundations of Islam remain safe and the enemies of Islam should despair of destroying it.

C. Shortage of strength and power to stage an uprising

On a number of occasions, Amirul Momineen (a) has considered lack of sufficient power as one of the reasons for his not having staged an uprising. The Imam has clarified in the third sermon of *Nahjul Balagha*:

> Then I began to think whether I should assault or endure calmly the blinding darkness of tribulations wherein the grown up are made feeble and the young grow old and the true believer acts under strain till he meets Allah (on his death). I found that endurance thereon was wiser. So I adopted patience, although there was pricking in the eye and suffocation (of mortification) in the throat. I watched the plundering of my inheritance...[4]

Imam (a) says in sermon 217:

> I looked around, but found no one to shield me, protect me or help me, except the members of my family. I refrained from flinging them into death and therefore, closed my eyes despite the dust, kept swallowing saliva despite (the suffocation of) grief and endured pangs of anger, although it was more bitter than colocynth and more grievous than the bite of knives.[5]

On another occasion the Imam pointed to thirty sheep that were grazing and said:

> By Allah, if I had as many supporters, I would have definitely staged an uprising.[6]

Or another occasion, it is mentioned that when 360 persons pledged allegiance to the Imam, he said: Meet me tomorrow at

such and such place with your heads shaved, but except for five: Abu Zar, Huzaifah, Miqdad, Ammar and Salman, no one appeared.[7]

Perhaps some might judge this wrongly and say: Amirul Momineen (a), who was the conqueror of the Battle of Badr, Uhad, Khyber, Hunain and Khandaq etc. Why he did not stage an uprising all alone? Why did he not display his feats again?

We reply: There is no basis to say that Amirul Momineen (a) should act in contravention of practice of the Holy Prophet (s) and the divine prophets. It is mentioned in a report that Amirul Momineen (a) said:

> The Prophet advised me that if I don't get supporters, I should restrain myself and secure my blood and that of my family members and followers.[8]

D. Avoiding division among Muslims and destruction of Islam

Among the reasonings based on statements and explanations of the Imam (a) it was to avoid division in the ranks of Muslims and destruction of Islam. In some reports of Amirul Momineen (a), it is mentioned that:

> By Allah, if I had not feared divisions in the ranks of Muslims, their reverting to infidelity and destruction of religion, I would have definitely confronted my opponent in a way they had never seen.[9]

The same point is mentioned by Ibne Abde Barr, a prominent Ahle Sunnat scholar in his book of *Istiab* under the biography of Rufaa bin Rafe, quoting from Amirul Momineen (a).[10]

E. Possibility of martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s) and her sons if Amirul Momineen (a) had confronted

Security of women and children are among the natural and common matters in all human beings; but it is clear that if one

comes to know that the aim of the enemy in confronting his ladies is only to instigate him to react so that his most important aim is fulfilled, he would keep himself under control and never do anything, which will allow the enemy to achieve his aim.

The aim of the attackers on the house of revelation was that Amirul Momineen (a) should be provoked to react and through this they may prove that a person like him is prepared to use the sword to remove a large number of people for getting worldly rulership.

And also if Amirul Momineen (a) had reacted and had been defeated by them, it was possible that Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and the sons would have been killed in this confrontation and the progeny of Imamate would have been cut off. Then enemies would have publicized that Ali (a) sacrificed his wife and children in pursuit of worldly rule and it was in fact the reason of their killing; as they said regarding Ammar Yasir, the loyal companion of Amirul Momineen (a).

F. Amirul Momineen (a) chose the best option

Circumstances dictated that Amirul Momineen (a) should either defend the foundation of Islam and give up his right or that a small group should attack him and he should repel them by sword and in exchange the enemies of Islam and hypocrites may take advantage of the opportunity to destroy the foundation of Islam, but through this sacrifice, Imam Ali (a) secured the religion of Islam forever and rendered the enemies of Islam hopeless.

Imam Ali (a) has said in the third sermon of *Nahjul Balagha*:

> Then I began to think whether I should assault or endure calmly the blinding darkness of tribulations wherein the grown up are made feeble and the young grow old and the true believer acts under strain till he

meets Allah (on his death). I found that endurance thereon was wiser. So I adopted patience, although there was pricking in the eye and suffocation (of mortification) in the throat. I watched the plundering of my inheritance...[11]

POLEMICAL REPLIES TO THE DOUBT

A. Why Prophet Lut (a) did not put up defense?

One who has raised the above doubt and said: Why Ali (a) did not stage an uprising? Or how his modesty permitted him to watch such a treatment being meted out to his wife; should reply to the same objection regarding Prophet Lut (a):

The wife of Prophet Lut (a) was a disbeliever, the community of Lut (a) was sinful; the disbelievers forced themselves into the house of Lut (a) and saw handsome youths there. They expressed their satantic desires with regard to those youths. Prophet Lut (a) said: Fear Allah; if you refrain from this vile deed, I will marry my daughters to you.

Now, a number of questions arise at this point, which the doubt raisers should reply:

Why Prophet Lut (a) was not ashamed of the evil behavior of his disbelieving community, why he did not take to arms and attack them? On the contrary, he suggested to them that he was ready to give his daughters in marriage to them. Can – God forbid – Prophet Lut (a) be blamed from shamelessness?

Pay attention to the translation of the verse of Quran in this regard:

"And when Our messengers came to Lut, he was grieved for them, and he lacked strength to protect them, and said: This is a hard day. And his people came to him, (as if) rushed on towards him, and already they did evil deeds. He said: O my people!

these are my daughters- they are purer for you, so guard against (the punishment of) Allah..." (Surah Hud 77-78)

B. Why the Holy Prophet (s) did not confront during the thirteen years of his stay in Mecca?

If not staging an uprising by Amirul Momineen (a) is an occasion for some questions, why with regard to not staging an uprising by the Holy Prophet (s) in Mecca for thirteen years is not having any objection?

Did the Messenger of Allah (s) not witness tortures and unlimited oppressions on Muslims in Mecca? Amirul Momineen (a), by this same argument did not show any reaction that the Messenger of Allah (s) at the time of killing of Sumayyah, mother of Ammar Yasir at the hands of the idolaters and his confrontation with them did not show any reaction.

Ibne Hajar Asqalani has written in *Isabah*:

> Sumayyah binte Khabbat...mother of Ammar Yasir is the seventh to embrace Islam. Abu Jahl harassed her and stabbed her in the lower abdomen with a spear till she achieved martyrdom. She was the first female martyr in Islam and since she had embraced Islam and did not give it up, the family of Bani Mughira tortured and harassed her till she was martyred. The Messenger of Allah (s) witnessed the scene of torture of Ammar and his parents in Mecca and said: O family of Yasir, be patient, as Paradise is promised to you.[12]

Since the Messenger of Allah (s) was seeing that idolaters like Abu Jahl were harassing Muslim ladies, he did not display any reaction to it and also ordered them to be absolute patient in all this.

Was the Messenger of Allah (s) not the most modest and valiant person of the world? Thus, why he did not defend the Muslim ladies? Why he did not take up the sword to strike off the head of Abu Jahl?

Whatever replies the Wahabis give with regard to the absence of staging uprising by the Holy Prophet (s), we will give the same reply to the topic of Amirul Momineen (a) not staging an uprising.

C. Why Umar did not defend his wife?

Umme Jamil was well known for her wantonness and was the target of accusations by one and all; and that Mughira bin Shoba had committed fornication with her was a well known historical fact.

Among the instances about which the Wahabi objection makers should reply is that:

> On the basis of Wahabis claims, Umme Kulthum, daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) was the wife of Umar. If we believe that this was nothing more than fiction, and the fact is something else; and that except casting numerous doubts on its fabricators it will achieve nothing; that if Allah wills we would also reply to the continuation of this objection – but in case we accept the supposition, the same objection is applicable to why Umar did not defend his wife, Umme Kulthum, which the Wahabis should reply?

The matter was that Mughira bin Shoba committed fornication with Umme Jamil and three persons testified as eye-witnesses and if the fourth testimony had been obtained, Mughira would have become eligible for penalty of fornication. During the journey of Hajj, Umar asked Mughira about Umme Jamil, who at that time was his partner in fornication: Are you familiar with her? Mughira with all impudence compared Umme Jamil

to Umme Kulthum. And said: Yes, she is Umme Kulthum, your wife. In fact Mughira was extremely insulting to the wife of Umar in this reply and he made allegation of fornication on Umme Kulthum. However Umar did not display any shame at this and he did not show any reaction and defense.

Ibne Khallikan in *Wafayatul Ayan* and Abul Faraj Isfahani in *Aghani* have written that:

> During Hajj, Umme Jamil (about whom three persons testified that Mughira has committed fornication with her and because the testimony of the fourth person could not be obtained, she was saved from the penalty of fornication) was in the company of Umar and Mughira was also present in Mecca at that time. Umar asked Mughira: Do you know who this woman is? Mughira replied: Yes, this is Umme Kulthum, the daughter of Ali. Umar said: Are you pretending to be ignorant? By Allah, I think that Abu Bakra didn't lie about you and whenever I see you, I fear that a stone will drop on my head from the sky.[13]

It was when Mughira bin Shoba was an old friend and an official of Umar and was under his control at that time, but despite that Umar did not argue with him at all.

Now, with numerous contradictions, which exist on this occasion, whatever justification Wahabis offer, we will give the same reply to the absence of defense of Amirul Momineen (a) for his wife.

D. Why Uthman did not defend his wife?

Wahabis should also reply to this subject:

When the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s) attacked the house of Uthman and cut off the fingers of his wife, Uthman did not defend his wife.

Whatever justification Wahabis offer here, we will give the same reply to this matter.

Tabari has written in his history:

> Sawdan bin Humran came forward to attack Uthman, Naila binte Farafisa (Uthman's wife) threw herself upon him. Sawdan took the sword and cut off her fingers and then hit at the teeth of Uthman's wife and said: What a great bodyguard he is having! Then he hit Uthman and killed him.[14]

Ibne Athir has mentioned the same point in his *Al-Kamil fit Tarikh*[15] and Ibne Kathir Damishqi Wahabi in *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*.[16]

Why Uthman did not defend his wife when he was a man, having modesty and he should have defended his wife? Thus, why did he not show any reaction when he witnessed companions of the Messenger of Allah (s) insulting his wife and confronting her?

E. If Amirul Momineen (a) did not defend, he also did not participate in the battles of Caliphs

Amirul Momineen (a) was the most valiant person of his time, there is no doubt that he was so brave and daring that his name deprived Arab stalwarts of their sleep; so much so that Umar bin Khattab said:

By Allah, if the sword of Ali (a) had not been there, the foundation of Islam would not have become stable.[17]

So much so that when all the unfaithful companions of the Messenger of Allah (s) during the Battle of Uhad and Hunain deserted the Prophet and fled from the battlefield, Imam Ali (a) circled the Messenger of Allah (s) like a moth going around the flame, and he defended him, but why Imam Ali (a) did not participate in any of the battles of the Caliphs?

One, who during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s) had actively participated in all the battles of Muslims against infidels, Jews...and was at the forefront bearing the standard of Islam before all the stalwarts and crushed one enemy warrior after another, why he was not present in any of the battles during the time of Caliphs?

Had he lost his valor, or he did not regard fighting at the side of the Caliphs as Jihad? Or the Caliphs opposed the practice of the Messenger of Allah (s) did not choose to take his help?

F. Supposing Amirul Momineen (a) did not defend, does it imply that he was in favor of oppression?

With attention to the references and sources of the first part of the book in proving oppression and martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s) and also rational and polemical replies, which were given to reply to this objection, and supposing we accept that Amirul Momineen (a) did not defend his wife, does this statement imply that he overlooked oppression of others and was satisfied with it?

NOTES

[1] *Kitab Sulaym bin Qays Hilali*, Pg. 568, Sulaym bin Qays Hilali (d. 80 A.H.), Intisharat Hadi - Qom, First edition, 1405 A.H.

[2] *Ruhul Maani fee Tafsirul Quranil Azeem wa Saba Mathani*, Vol. 3, Pg. 124, Allamah Abul Fadhl Shahabuddin Sayyid Mahmud Alusi Baghdadi (d. 1270 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[3] *Khasaisul Aaimma (a)*, Pg. 73, Abul Hasan Muhammad bin Husain bin Musa Musawi Baghdadi, Sharif Razi (d. 406 A.H.), Edited and compiled by Dr. Muhammad Hadi Amini, Majmaul Baluth Islamiya Astana Rizvia Muqaddisa, Mashad – Iran, 1406 A.H.

Biharul Anwar, Vol. 22, Pg. 484, Muhammad Baqir Majlisi (d. 1111 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Baqir Bahbudi, Mausasul Wafa – Beirut – Lebanon, Second corrected edition, 1403 – 1983 A.D.

[4] *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermons of Imam Ali (a), Sermon 3, Vol. 1, Pg. 31

[5] *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermons of Imam Ali (a), Sermon 217, Vol. 1, Pg. 31

[6] The narrator says: The Imam came out of the Masjid and came to a walled compound in which there were thirty sheep. He said: By Allah, if I had as many supporters, who had been well wishers for Allah and His Messenger, I would have indeed removed the son of the fly snapper from his throne.

Al-Kafi, Shaykh Kulaini, Vol. 8, Pg. 32

[7] At dusk 360 persons pledged allegiance of death to Amirul Momineen (a) (that they would support him till the end of their lives) Imam (a) said to them: Come besides Ahjaar Zayt (a place on the outskirts of Medina) tomorrow morning (and mentioned shaving of the heads as a sign of loyalty). Amirul Momineen (a) himself got himself tonsured, but the following day, except for Abu Zar, Miqdad, Huzaifah bin Yaman, Ammar bin Yasir and Salman, no one appeared. Ali (a) raised his hands to the sky and said: O Allah, these people have humiliated me as Bani Israel insulted Harun...

Al-Kafi, Shaykh Kulaini, Vol. 8, Pg. 33

[8] *Mustadrakul Wasail*, Mirza Noori, Vol. 11, Pg. 75 – *Misbahul Balagha* (*Mustadrak Nahjul Balagha*), Mir Jahani, Vol. 3, Pg. 6 – *Kitab Sulaym bin Qays*, Edited: Muhammad Baqir Ansari, Pg, 304 –

Al-Mohtazar, Hasan bin Sulaiman Hilli, Pg. 111- *Hilyatul Abrar*, Sayyid Hashim Bahraini, Vol. 2, Pg. 64 – *Jami Ahadithus Shia*, Sayyid Burujardi, Vol. 13, Pg. 41 – *Al-Ghaibat*, Shaykh Tusi, Pg. 193 – *Al-Ihtijaj*, Shaykh Tabarsi, Vol. 1, Pg. 280.

[9] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 1, Pg. 184, Abu Hamid Izuddin bin Hibatullah bin Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Abil Hadid Madaini (d. 655 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut / Lebanon 1418 A.H. – 1998 A.D. First edition, Edited: Muhammad Abdul Karim Namri.

[10] *Al-Istiab fee Marifatul Ashab*, Vol. 2, Pg. 497, Yusuf bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abde Barr (d. 463), Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1412, First edition, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi.

[11] *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermons of Imam Ali (a), Sermon 3, Vol. 1, Pg. 31

[12] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 7, Pg. 712, no. 11342, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition. 1412 – 1992.

[13] *Wafayatul Ayan wa Anba Abnaul Zaman*, Vol. 6, Pg. 366, Abul Abbas Shamsuddin Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Abu Bakr Ibne Khallikan (d. 681 A.H.), Edited: Ahsan Abbas, Darul Thaqafa – Lebanon.

Al-Aghani, Vol. 16, Pg. 109, Abul Faraj Isfahani (d. 356 A.H.), Darul Fikr at-Taba-a wan Nashr, Lebanon, Edited: Ali Mahna and Samir Jabir.

[14] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 676, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut.

[15] *Al-Kamil fit Tarikh*, Vol. 3, Pg. 68, Izzuddin bin Athir Abul Hasan Ali bin Muhammad Jazari (d. 630 A.H.), Edited: Abdullah Qadi, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut, second edition, 1415 A.H.

[16] *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 7, Pg. 188, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Abul Fida Qarashi Damishqi (d. 774 A.H.), Maktabul Marif – Beirut.

[17] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 12, Pg. 51, Egypt Ibne Abil Hadid Madaini Mutazali Abu Hamid Izzuddin bin Hibatullah bin Muhammad bin Muhammad (d. 655 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Abdul Karim Namri, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut / Lebanon, First Edition, 1418 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

OBJECTION 8:
IF FATIMA (S) WAS ATTACKED, WHY BANI HASHIM DID NOT DEFEND HER?

EXPLANATION

Wahabis, in order to deny the attack on the house of revelation, have raised objections like the one mentioned above:

The Holy Prophet (s) was able to train thousands of loyal persons and those devoted to Islam; that they should be present on the path of Allah and defend it; and his Ahle Bayt (a) laid down their lives for its sake. In case we accept the attack on the house of Fatima (r), which the enemies of Islam consider to be true, the question arises that why Bani Hashim witnessed the daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) being slapped, burning down of the door of the house, killing of the six month old Mohsin...but not once did they utter the least protest? All of them were sincere and loyal Muslims, who had ties of relationship with the Prophet and also had communal ties with him; what happened that they kept absolutely quiet and did not raise any objection?

RATIONAL REPLY

With attention to many similarities, which exist between the previous doubt and the present one, many replies can also be common, but despite that we will mention some instances.

Firstly, the above statement is having more emotional and provoking words than reasoning and logical proofs, because reports have been recorded in Ahle Sunnat books with correct and proved chains of narrators and we mentioned them in the first part of this book, thus confirming attack on the house of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and Amirul Momineen (a) and removing all kinds of doubts in this matter.

Moreover, with reference to authentic Ahle Sunnat and Wahabi texts, it can be easily concluded that even if the people of Medina had wanted to defend, they did not have any power to take any such steps due to the circumstances that arose there.

Role of Bani Aslam tribe in opposing Bani Hashim and strengthening of Abu Bakr's regime

While Amirul Momineen (a) was busy with the last rites of the Messenger of Allah (s), Quraish and its leaders: Abu Bakr and Umar usurped his right and through the greed of characters like Abu Sufyan managed to win the loyalties of some people of Quraish. By this description it becomes clear that other tribes did not have the strength to confront Quraish.

Abu Bakr and Umar had gathered in Medina numerous nomad tribes who had embraced Islam at the point of the sword and attracted the attention of new Muslims to their personal gains, as Amirul Momineen (a) in all the battles was the pivot of victory of Islam and they harbored deep animosity with him and the hypocrites took advantage of this same malice.

Thus, taking advantage of the divisions in this group and also the nomadic desert tribes of the outskirts of Medina surrounded the house of Amirul Momineen (a) and wanted to reduce it to ashes.

Tabari in his *Tarikh*, Mawardi Shafei in *Hawiul Kabir* and Abdul Wahab Nuwairi in *Nihayatul Arab* say:

> The Aslam tribe had crowded Medina in such a way that lanes and by-lanes were overflowing with them so that allegiance of Abu Bakr may take place. Later, Umar used to say: When I saw the Aslam tribe, I became sure of victory.[1]

Reason for absence of defense of Bani Hashim and Ansar according to the view of Amirul Momineen (a)

Amirul Mominеen (a) has mentioned the absence of defense by the companions (except Bani Hashim, companions and Ansar) in some of his sermons:

> O my Allah! I beseech Thee to take revenge on the Quraish and those who are assisting them, for they have cut asunder my kinship and overturned my cup and have joined together to contest a right to which I was entitled more than anyone else. They said to me: "If you get your right, it will be just, but if you are denied the right, that too will be just. Endure it with sadness or kill yourself in grief." I looked around, but found no one to shield me, protect me or help me except the members of my family. I refrained from flinging them into death and therefore, closed my eyes despite the dust, kept swallowing saliva despite (the suffocation of) grief and endured pangs of anger, although it was more bitter than colocynth and more grievous than the bite of knives.[2]

Ibne Abil Hadid says in *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*:

> Amirul Momineen (a), after the incident of Saqifah expressed anguish and demanded his right; he sought help and protested; because they did not come to him and pay allegiance to him. He said facing the tomb of the Messenger of Allah (s):
>
> "Son of my mother! surely the people reckoned me weak and had well-nigh slain me..." (Surah Araaf 7:150)[3]

There are numerous other instances as well, but we have not quoted them all here for the sake of brevity.

POLEMICAL REPLY ACCORDING TO WAHABI SOURCES

On the basis of sources acceptable to Wahabis, Bani Hashim and other Ansar, by not defending Lady Fatima (s), have in fact obeyed the directions of the Messenger of Allah (s), because Wahabis in order to prove the legality of the Caliphate of the Caliphs have narrated in their books that the Messenger of Allah (s) ordered his companions that they should, at all cost, obey the Caliphs after him; even if they do not enforce the practice of the Messenger of Allah (s), seize and usurp the property of people and instead of guiding the people, encourage them to follow the path of deviation.

Muslim Nishapuri has, in the report of Huzaifah bin Yaman, mentioned that the Messenger of Allah (s) said:

> There will be leaders, who will not be led by my guidance and who will not adopt my ways? There will be among them men who will have the hearts of devils in the bodies of human beings. I said: What should I do, O Messenger of Allah, if I (happen) to live in that time? He replied: You will listen to the Amir and carry out his orders; even if your back is flogged and your wealth is snatched, you should listen and obey.[4]

On the basis of this, because of their sources, Wahabis are compelled to accept that the absence of defense of Bani Hashim and other companions was in accordance to the command of the Messenger of Allah (s) and the common good of the Islamic society.

NOTES

[1] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 244, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya – Beirut.

Al-Hawi al-Kabir, Vol. 14, Pg. 99, Ali bin Muhammad bin Habib Mawardi Basri Shafei (d. 450 A.H.), Edited: Shaykh Ali Muhammad Maooz – Shaykh Adil Ahmad Abdul Majud, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut – Lebanon, First edition, 1419 A.H. and 1999 A.D.

Nihayatul Arab fee Funoonal Adab, Vol. 19, Pg. 21, Shahabuddin Ahmad bin Abdul Wahab Nuwairi (d. 733 A.H.), Edited: Mufeed Qamhiya and Co., Darul Kutubul Ilmiya – Beirut – Lebanon, First edition, 1424 A.H. and 2004 A.D.

[2] *Nahjul Balagha*, Muhammad Abduh, Vol. 2, Pg. 202, Sermon 217, - *Al-Imamah was Siyasah*, Ibne Qutaibah, Vol. 1, Pg. 134 – *Majmaul Amthal*, Ahmad bin Muhammad Maidani Nishapuri (d. 528), Vol. 2, Pg. 282 – *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Ibne Abil Hadid, Vol. 6, Pg. 95 & Vol. 11, Pg. 109.

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 11, Pg. 65, Abu Hamid Izzuddin bin Hibatullah bin Muhammad bin Muhammad Ibne Abil Hadid Madaini Mutazali (d. 655 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Abdul Karim Namri, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut / Lebanon, First Edition, 1418 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[4] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1486, Tr. 1847, Kitabul Imarah, Chapter of 'Instruction to stick to the main body of Muslims in the time of trials and warning against those inviting people to disbelief', Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Hasan Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.). Edited: Muhammad Fawad al-Baqi, Darul Ahyaul Turathul Arabi, Beirut.

OBJECTION 9:
LADY ZAHRA (S) ALSO OBJECTED TO ALI (A)

EXPLANATION

Wahabis have said in one of their objections:

According to reports of Shia, Lady Zahra (r), after returning from the Masjid and after delivering the sermon, became infuriated at Ali (r) that you are sitting like this and they have usurped your and my right.

But do you Shia not believe that Fatima is infallible? Can one infallible pass a remark on another infallible?

RATIONAL REPLY

The actual report against which the Wahabis have objected is as follows:

> When Lady Zahra (s) returned to her house after protesting before the people of Medina, she addressed Amirul Momineen (a): O son of Abu Talib, peace be on you. People are sitting in the corner like a child in the womb with the limbs withdrawn and like accused persons. This son of Abu Qahafa [Abu Bakr] has snatched away the gift of my father and the means of simple livelihood of my children. He [Abu Bakr] tried to be inimical to me and I found him the most severe enemy; till the Ansar failed to render their support to me...Alas if I had died before this seclusion and [apparent] insult. The Almighty Allah would excuse you on my behalf as you kept injustices away from me in a number of instances and supported me...[1]

In reply to this report, we say: Apart from the fact that this report is having incomplete chain of narrators, Allamah

Majlisi (a.r.) and other Shia scholars have given replies to this objection, some which we shall mention below:

A. Reply of Allamah Majlisi (discussion of the evil deeds of Abu Bakr)

Allamah Majlisi (r) [died 1111 A.H.], in his book, *Biharul Anwar*, has replied to this doubt as follows:

In fact, the caustic remark of Lady Zahra (s) aimed to highlight the evil acts of the regime and explain to others what oppression the usurpers have wrought.

In many instances, when man wants to explain something to someone, he makes him a target of anger and addresses him in fury, whereas his aim is not to be angry upon him. This behavior was customary in speech. Like a ruler, who sees some people engrossed in some act against him, in order to express his displeasure at them, he displays anger at some of his officials, while he knows that they had not been deficient in this regard. However, he wanted to, through this expression of anger to highlight to everyone the vileness of those people. Another example is that when Prophet Musa (a) returned from Mt. Tur and found the Jews engrossed in worship of the calf, while he knew that Harun (a) was not having any shortcoming in this regard, but in spite of that he seized his beard and said to him in anger: *"O Harun! what prevented you, when you saw them going astray, so that you did not follow me?"*

Harun said: *O son of my mother! seize me not by my beard nor by my head; surely I was afraid lest you should say: You have caused a division among the children of Israel and not waited for my word."*[2]

Lady Zahra (s) also wanted through this to highlight the enormity of the oppression that had befallen her husband...so that the people of that time and those who were to come later should understand what oppression has befallen Ahle Bayt (a).[3]

Thus, on the basis of the justification that the Late Allamah Majlisi has presented regarding this report: it was not accusation anger and fury in this case, on the contrary, it was the uppermost limit of anguish of the respected daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) over the oppression wrought on her honorable husband, so that history may record this matter.

B. Proving the Usurpation of Her Rights

In fact, by these statements, Lady Fatima Zahra (s) made some facts absolutely clear, so that they may be recorded in history and get noticed by coming generations. The Lady addressed Amirul Momineen (a) and said:

Son of Abu Qahafa [Abu Bakr] has snatched away the gift of my father and the means of simple livelihood of my children.

In this statement, Lady Fatima (s) has hinted at three fundamental points:

1. Fadak was the gift of the Holy Prophet (s)

The phrase of 'my father's gift' proves that Fadak was the gift of the Holy Prophet (s) to Lady Fatima Zahra (s), which senior Ahle Sunnat scholars, like Tabari (d. 310 A.H.) and Dhahabi (d. 748 A.H.) have also clearly mentioned; that Fadak was the personal property of the Holy Prophet (s) and he had gifted it to Lady Fatima Zahra (s):

> Khyber was the public property of all Muslims, but Fadak belonged only to the Messenger of Allah (s) as it was not obtained through fighting.[4]

Jalaluddin Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.) writes:

> Bazzar, Abu Yala, Ibne Abi Hatim and Ibne Marduya have narrated from Abu Saeed Khudri: When the verse: "And give to the near of kin his due... (17:26)" was revealed, the Messenger of Allah (s) called Fatima and gifted Fadak to her.[5]

2. Fadak was the sole source of livelihood for the children Lady Fatima Zahra (s)

The phrase of 'livelihood of my children' shows that Fadak was the sole source of income for the family of Lady Fatima Zahra (s), and Amirul Momineen (a) has also mentioned this in his letter to Uthman bin Hunayf:

> Yes, from all that on which the sky has shaded, only Fadak was under our control, but people were miserly about it and other generous people ignored it.[6]

3. Usurping the right of Fatima (s)

The phrase of 'This son of Abu Qahafa [Abu Bakr] has snatched...' proves that Abu Bakr had usurped the confirmed rights of Lady Fatima Zahra (s).

Yaqut Hamuyi (d. 626 A.H.), in *Mojamul Buldan,* after explaining the geography of Fadak has written:

> This Fadak is the same, about which Lady Fatima (s) said that the Holy Prophet (s) had gifted it to her.[7]

In *Tarikh Medina,* Ibne Shibba (d. 262 A.H.) has narrated from Numairi, son of Hassan that he said to Zaid bin Ali:

> I wanted to condemn the act of Abu Bakr that he had usurped the right of Fatima (s)... Fatima Zahra (s) came to Abu Bakr and said: The Messenger of Allah (s) gave Fadak to me. Abu Bakr said: Can you support your claim with an eyewitness? Fatima (s) brought Ali (a) and he testified. After that she brought Umme Aiman as a witness. She said to Abu Bakr: Do you not testify that I am from the folks of Paradise? Abu Bakr replied: Yes. Umme Aiman said: I testify that the Holy Prophet (s) gifted Fadak to Fatima Zahra (s). Abu Bakr said in reply to Fatima (s): Do you want to obtain your right on the basis of the testimony of a man and a woman?[8]

When Lady Fatima Zahra (s) perceived that Abu Bakr was not at all prepared to accept that Fadak was the personal property of the Prophet, she demanded it from him as an inheritance of her father. This time Abu Bakr attributed a false tradition to the Messenger of Allah (s). That he (s) had said: We are the congregation of prophets, we do not leave any inheritance and everything left by us is charity (*Sadaqah*).

The proof of the falsity of this statement is that:

Firstly, this tradition is openly in contravention of the clear verses of Quran, which talk of Prophet Sulaiman (a) inheriting from Prophet Dawood (a):

"And Sulaiman was Dawood's heir..."[9]

Secondly: A group of Ahle Sunnat scholars, like Dhahabi considers this report false. They have narrated the following from some Ahle Sunnat scholars:

Ibne Adi has narrated from Abda: I asked Ibne Kharash: What type of tradition: 'What we leave is charity', is? He replied: It is false, since Malik bin Aws has been accused of lying.[10]

Thirdly: Lady Fatima Zahra (s) was enraged at the attitude of Abu Bakr and was furious at him and till her last moments she did not speak to him. Bukhari narrates that:

> Fatima became angry and she did not meet Abu Bakr and this continued till her demise and she did not live for more than six months after the passing away of the Prophet.[11]

Fourth: Imam Ali (a) also, after the martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s) and the death of Abu Bakr, during Caliphate of Umar, raised the issue and Bukhari has narrated the statement of Umar bin Khattab as follows:

> (O Abbas!) You came to me asking for your share from the property of your nephew, and this man (Ali) came to me, asking for the share of his wife from the property of her father.[12]

Fifthly: If the prophets did not leave any inheritance and all their property is charity why Umar returned it to successors of the Prophet against the view of Abu Bakr? Why Uthman handed it over to Marwan against the view of Abu Bakr and Umar?

Why according to the evidence of history, the raising of the issue by Amirul Momineen (a) bore fruits and according to the clarification of Bukhari, Umar was compelled to restore the properties of the Messenger of Allah (s)?

Umar bin Khattab restored the Prophet's property (of Sadaqah) at Medina to Ali and Abbas.[13]

Yaqut Hamuyi has also written:

> During the period of Umar bin Khattab, for expansion of boundaries of Muslim kingdom and welfare of Muslims, the jurisprudence of Umar bin Khattab adjudged that Fadak should be returned to the successors of the Prophet.[14]

However, after him, when Uthman succeeded to Caliphate he transferred the ownership of Fadak to his favorite son-in-law, Marwan bin Hakam. Abul Fida has mentioned in his *Tarikh*:

> Uthman gifted Fadak to Marwan and this Fadak was the endowment of the Holy Prophet (s), which Fatima had demanded from Abu Bakr.[15]

The fabricated report of Abu Bakr: "We, prophets do not leave inheritance," can be rebutted with other replies also, but I have refrained from stating them all here for the sake of brevity.

NOTES

[1] *Al-Ihtijaj*, Vol. 1, Pg. 145, Abu Mansur Ahmad bin Ali bin Abu Talib Tabarsi (d. 548 A.H.), Edited with notes: Sayyid Muhammad Baqir Khorasan, Darun Noman Lit Taba-a wan Nashr – Najaf Ashraf, 1386 A.H. 1966 A.D.

[2] Surah Taha 20:94

[3] *Biharul Anwar*, Vol. 29, Pg. 234. Muhammad Baqir Majlisi (d. 1111 A.H.) Edited: Muhammad Baqir Bahbudi, Mausasul Wafa – Beirut – Lebanon, Second corrected edition, 1403 – 1983 A.D.

[4] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 138, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiyya – Beirut.

Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 2, Pg. 422, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi, (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition. Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri

[5] *Durre Manthur*, Vol. 5, Pg. 273, Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr Jalaluddin Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.), Darul Fikr – Beirut – 1993 A.H.

[6] *Nahjul Balagha*, Subh Salih, Letter no. 45.

Tadkiratul Hamduniya, Vol. 1, Pg. 99, Muhammad bin Hasan bin Muhammad bin Ali Ibne Hamdun (d. 608a A.H.), Edited: Ahsan Abbas, Bakr Abbas, Dar Sadir – Beirut, First edition, 1996.

[7] *Mojamul Buldan*, Vol. 4, Pg. 238, Abu Abdullah bin Yaqut bin Abdullah Hamuyi (d. 626 A.H.), Darul Fikr – Beirut.

[8] *Tarikhul Medina Munawwara*, Vol. 1, Pg. 124, Tr. 554, Abu Zaid Umar bin Shabatul Numairi Basri (d. 262 A.H.), Edited: Ali Muhammad Dandal and Yasin Saduddin Bayan, Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut – 1417 A.H. – 1996 A.D.

Sawaiqul Mohriqa Alaa Ahle Rafdh wa Zalaal wa Zandaqa, Vol. 1, Pg. 157, Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Hajar Haithami (d. 973 A.H.), Edited: Abdur Rahman bin Abdullah Turki – Kamil Muhammad Kharat, Mausasitur Risala, Lebanon, 1417 A.H. – 1997 A.D.

[9] Surah Naml 27:16

[10] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 14, Pg. 510, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[11] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1126, Tr. no. 2926, Chapter of Khums, Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari Jofi, Abu Abdullah (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[12] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1126, Tr. no. 2927, Chapter of Khums, Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari Jofi, Abu Abdullah (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[13] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1126, Tr. no. 2926, Chapter of Khums, Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari Jofi, Abu Abdullah (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[14] *Mojamul Buldan*, Vol. 4, Pg. 239, Abu Abdullah bin Yaqut bin Abdullah Hamuyi (d. 626 A.H.), Darul Fikr – Beirut.

[15] *Al-Mukhtasar fee Akhbaaral Bashar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 116, Abul Fida, Imaduddin Ismail bin Ali (732 A.H.).

Tarikh Ibnul Wardi, Vol. 1, Pg. 145, Ibnul Wardi Umar bin Muzaffar

SECONDARY OBJECTION 10: IS IT ALLOWED FOR AN INFALLIBLE TO PRAY FOR DEATH?

EXPLANATION

By reading the report, which was mentioned in the previous objection, it is possible that a doubt may appear in the mind of readers, that the report in which Lady Zahra (s) has addressed Amirul Momineen (a):

Alas, if before this seclusion I was already dead![1]

Does a wish for death by an infallible like Lady Fatima Zahra (s) not create a doubt?

LOGICAL REPLY

In reply we say: Allah, the Mighty and Sublime says regarding Lady Maryam (a) in the Holy Quran:

> "And the throes (of childbirth) compelled her to betake herself to the trunk of a palm tree. She said: Oh, would that I had died before this, and had been a thing quite forgotten!" (Surah Maryam 19:23)

Without any doubt, if desire of death in the conditions that Lady Maryam (a) was placed and she saw her honor and position in danger, it is doubtful whether Allah, the Mighty and Sublime refuted her and did not support her through silence.

Lady Zahra (s) was also in similar circumstances; because she had not expected the people, whom her father had saved from polytheism and idolatry and imparted honor and success to, that just within a few days of his passing away, they should forget everything and usurp the property of his daughter.

In these circumstances also, Lady Zahra (s) has expressed the same desire that was mentioned by Lady Maryam (a), so that perhaps she might my have the capacity to witness these severe tragedies; calamities, which according to her own statement, if they had fallen on days, they would have been transformed into dark nights.df[2]

NOTES

[1] The complete text of this report was mentioned in the above objection.

[2] Ibne Asakir in *Tohfa* on the authority of Tahir bin Yahya Husaini through his chains from Amirul Momineen, Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) that he said:

When the Messenger of Allah (s) was buried, Fatima came to his holy grave and taking a handful of dust from the grave put it to her eyes and wept and recited the following couplets:

It is not surprising that one who smells the dust of the grave of the Prophet and does not perceive another fragrance. Such calamities have befallen me that if they had fallen on days they would have transformed into nights.

Sobolul Huda war Rishad fee Seerat Khairul Ibad, Vol. 12, Pg. 338, Muhammad bin Yusuf Salihi Shami (d. 932 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1414 A.H. First edition, Edited: Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud & Ali Muhammad Maudh.

OBJECTION II:
HOW DID THE MODESTY OF ALI ALLOW THAT FATIMA SHOULD GO BEHIND THE DOOR?

EXPLANATION

Among the objections that Wahabis have expressed is:

How can it be believed that in spite of the fact that Ali (a) was present in the house, his wife Fatima should go to the door and such an accident should take place? Why Ali (a) himself or another person from those present in the house did not step forward to open the door? Can it be justified logically that Ali (a) should send Fatima to the door when strangers were present behind it?

LOGICAL REPLY

A. The door was open and Fatima went to the open door in order to close it upon the persons who were besieging the house

As opposed to today's custom, when in towns usually the doors are kept closed all the time and only opened when someone knocks from outside, during those days, like it is customary in many villages even today that the doors usually remain open all day and only those who have sought permission can enter.

On the same basis, it is concluded from some traditional reports that at the time of the occurrence of his incident the door was open and Lady Fatima Zahra (s) was near it; and on seeing the attackers heading for her house she went behind the door and closed it upon them.

The Late Ayyashi, Shaykh Mufeed and others have written:

> The narrator states that Umar said: Get up, let us go to Ali. Abu Bakr, Uthman, Khalid bin Walid, Mughira bin Shoba, Abu Ubaidah Jarrah, Saalim the freed slave of Abu Huzaifah, Qunfadh and I stood up with them. When we came near the house, Fatima saw us and that is why she closed the door on our faces. Fatima was certain that Umar will not enter without permission. Umar kicked and broke the door, which was made of date trunks. He and his companions entered the house and shouted 'God is the greatest' upon their success. They brought Ali (a) out of the house.[1]

In the report of Sulaym, it is also mentioned:

> Umar came to the door of Ali and Fatima. Fatima was seated behind the door. Her head was tied and her body had turned frail and weak due to the loss of her father. Umar knocked at the door and said: Son of Abu Talib, open the door. Fatima said: Umar, what do you want from us? Leave us alone in the calamity that has befallen us. Umar said: Open the door, otherwise I would burn down the house. Fatima asked: Do you not fear the Almighty Allah that we are present in the house? Umar did not retreat and he called for fire and set the door afire.[2]

B. Expectation of Lady Zahra (s) that the besiegers would seek permission to enter the house

On the other hand Lady Fatima Zahra (s) was sure that Umar and the people accompanying him would not enter the house without permission according to the commands of Quran and Islamic laws, because the commands of Quran on all Muslims are as such.

> "O you who believe! Do not enter houses other than your own houses until you have asked permission and saluted their inmates; this is better for you, that you may be mindful. But if you do not find anyone therein, then do not enter them until permission is given to you; and if it is said to you: Go back, then go back; this is purer for you; and Allah is Cognizant of what you do." (24:27-28)

In addition to the fact that the house of divine prophets is having special position, it is necessary to accord more respect to them, as the Holy Quran has advised this especially:

> "O you who believe! do not enter the houses of the Prophet unless permission is given to you..." (33:53)

Without any doubt, the house of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) is also considered as the house of the Prophet as clarified in numerous commentaries of Ahle Sunnat scholars.

Famous Ahle Sunnat commentators, like Suyuti and others in the commentary of the 36th verse of Surah Nur[3] have narrated from the Messenger of Allah (s) that the house of Ali and Zahra (s) is considered to be the most excellent of the houses of the prophets.[4]

In addition to this, it was expected that with attention to the status of Lady Zahra (s) and respect of the Holy Prophet (s) in the view of Muslims of the early period of Islam, the besiegers on seeing that lady would feel ashamed and not barge into the house and go away from there as some persons did on hearing the voice of Lady Zahra (s).

Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari writes:

> Umar came to the house of Fatima with a group of people. Fatima, on hearing the voice of the crowd wailed in a loud voice: O Messenger of Allah (s)! After

you what all we had to suffer at the hands of the sons of Khattab (Umar) and Abu Qahafa (Abu Bakr)?! Some people were moved by Fatima's wailing and left the place weeping, but Umar remained there with other persons.[5]

Therefore, this objection returns to the shamelessness of the attackers, who did not respect the sanctity of that house and its occupants and it does not in any way harm the character of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) and Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a).

POLEMICAL REPLY

A. How the Prophet allowed his wives to open door for strangers?

A glance at the practice of the Prophet (s) in this matter is the best rebuttal to the objection makers; because a number of instances are mentioned in books of Shia and Sunni that His Eminence permitted his wives to open the door for strangers.

1- Umme Salma and opening of the door for Ali (a):

The Messenger of Allah (s) emerged from the chambers of Zainab binte Jahash and entered the room of Umme Salma since that day it was turn for him to stay at her place. Not much time passed that Ali (a) knocked at the door softly. The Messenger of Allah (s) woke up. Umme Salma did not reply. The Prophet said: Get up and open the door...[6]

2- Ayesha and opening of the door at the command of the Messenger of Allah (s):

Amirul Momineen (a) says: I recited the Morning Prayers with the Messenger of Allah (s) and came out of the Masjid with him. His Eminence said: I am going to the house of Ayesha. I also came to Fatima and we

all enjoyed the company of Hasan and Husain. After that I went to the house of Ayesha and knocked at the door. She asked: Who's there? I replied: Ali. She said: The Prophet is asleep. I returned to my house and (after sometime) again came to her place and knocked. She asked: Who's there? I replied: Ali. She said: The Prophet is busy. I could not remain patient anymore and I knocked the third time. Ayesha asked: Who's there? I replied: Ali. I heard the voice of the Messenger of Allah (s) saying: Ayesha, open the door. Ayesha opened the door and I entered...[7]

B. Why the Prophet allowed Umar and Ayesha to sit at the same table?

According to reports having correct chain of narrators, which Wahabis have mentioned in most of their books, the Messenger of Allah (s) allowed Umar bin Khattab to sit with Ayesha on the same dinner table and they have even narrated that when they were eating from the same plate, the hand of Ayesha touched against Umar's.

Ibne Abi Shaybah in *Musannaf*, Bukhari in *Adabul Mufarrad*, Ibne Abi Hatim, Ibne Kathir and others have mentioned in their commentaries that:

> The Messenger of Allah (s) was having his dinner with Ayesha when Umar entered. His Eminence invited him to join them. Umar came forward and his hand was in the dish when it touched Ayesha's hand. Umar said: Oh, if the Prophet had observed Hijab for his wives from me, no eye would have seen them.[8]

NOTES

[1] *Tafsir Ayyashi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 67, Abi Nadhar, Muhammad bin Masud bin Ayyash Salmi Samarqandi, alias Ayyashi (d. 323 A.H.); Researched, edited and referenced by Sayyid Hashim Rasooli Hamallati, Maktaba Ilmiya Islamiya, Tehran.

Al-Ikhtisaas, Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Noman, Ibne Muallim Abi Abdullah Akbari Baghdadi Shaykh Mufeed (d. 413 A.H.), Edited: Ali Akbar Ghaffari, Sayyid Mahmud Zarandi, Darul Mufeed Lit Taba wan Nashar wa Tauzih, Beirut, Second Edition, 1414 - 1993.

Biharul Anwar, Vol. 28, Pg. 227, Muhammad Baqir Majlisi (d. 1111 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Baqir Bahbudi, Mausasul Wafa – Beirut – Lebanon, Second corrected edition, 1403 – 1983 A.D.

[2] *Kitab Sulaym bin Qays Hilali*, Pg. 864, Sulaym bin Qays Hilali (d. 80 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Baqir Ansari, Intisharat Hadi - Qom, First edition, 1405 A.H.

"In houses which Allah has permitted to be exalted and that His name may be remembered in them; there glorify Him therein in the mornings and the evenings."

[4] Ibne Marduya has narrated from Ansar bin Malik and Buraidah that he said: The Messenger of Allah (s) recited this verse: *"In houses which Allah has permitted to be exalted and that His name may be remembered in them; there glorify Him therein in the mornings and the evenings."* A man stood up and asked: Which house is this, O Messenger of Allah (s)? He replied: Houses of the prophets. Abu Bakr stood up and asked: O Messenger of Allah (s), is the house of Ali and Fatima from these houses. He replied: Yes, and more excellent than them.

Ad-Durrul Manthur, Vol. 6, Pg. 203, Abdur Rahman bin Kamaal Jalaluddin Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut – 1993.

Al-Kashf wal Bayan (*Tafsir Thalabi*), Vol. 7, Pg. 107, Abu Ishaq Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ibrahim Thalabi Nishapuri (d. 427 A.H. – 1035 A.D.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, 1422 A.H. – 2002 A.D. First edition, Edited: Al-Imam Abu Muhammad bin Ashur, Reference and research: Ustad Nazir Saadi.

Al-Jawahirul Ahsan fee Tafseeru Quran (Tafsir Thaalabi), Vol. 7, Pg. 107, Abdur Rahman bin Muhammad bin Makhluf Thaalabi (d. 875), Mausasal Aalami Lil Matbuat, Beirut.

Ruhul Maani fee Tafsirul Quranil Azeem wa Saba Mathani, Vol. 18, Pg. 74. Allamah Abul Fadhl Shahabuddin Sayyid Mahmud Alusi Baghdadi, (d. 1270 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[5] *Al-Imamah was Siyasah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 16, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim Ibne Qutaibah Dainawari (d.276 A.H.), Edited: Khalil al-Mansur, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1418 A.H. – 1997 A.D. Edited: Shiri, Vol. 1, Pg. 38, Edited: Zaini, Vol. 1, Pg. 24

[6] *Tarikh Medina Damishq wa Zikr Fadhlaha wa Tasmiya man Halha minal Amail*, Vol. 42, Pg. 470, Abul Qasim Ali bin Hasan Ibne Hibtullah bin Abdullah Shafei, (d. 571 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1995, Edited: Mohibbuddin Abi Saeed Umar bin Ghrama Umari;

At-Tadween fee Akhbari Qazween, Vol. 1, Pg. 89, Abdul Karim bin Muhammad Raafi-i Qazwini (d. 623 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, Edited: Azizullah Attari, 1987 A.H.

[7] *Al-Ihtijaj*, Vol. 1, Pg. 292 & 293, Abu Mansur Ahmad bin Ali bin Abu Talib Tabarsi (d. 548 A.H.), Edited with notes: Sayyid Muhammad Baqir Khorasan, Darun Noman Lit Taba-a wan Nashr – Najaf Ashraf, 1386 A.H. 1966 A.D.

[8] *Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 8, Pg. 531, Abul Fadhl Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut – 1379, Edited: Muhibuddin Khatib.

The above report is also mentioned in reliable Ahle Sunnat sources.

OBJECTION 12:
IF RIVALRY EXISTED, WHY ALI (A) NAMED HIS SONS UMAR, ABU BAKR AND UTHMAN?

PATTERN OF OBJECTION

Shia claim that the first and second Caliphs attacked the house of Fatima (r) whereas we know that Ali (a) named some of his issues after the Caliphs. This shows that the Caliphs are exonerated from these allegations. Does anyone name his children on his enemies?

LOGICAL REPLY

A. Absence of restricting the name to a particular person

Names are never related to any particular person. In the same way, names like Umar, Abu Bakr and Uthman were not limited to these persons and numerous other people were also named as such.

That is why names like Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were common names and numerous persons during the time of the Prophet were known by these names.

Thus, overlooking the replies that follow, it cannot be said that selection of these names was due to attachment and friendly relations between His Eminence and the Caliphs, because it is possible that His Eminence had attachment with other people having the same names.

B. Naming as Abu Bakr

Especially with regard to naming one of the sons of Amirul Momineen (a) on the name of Abu Bakr; if it was as some have claimed, Abu Bakr was an agnomen (*Kunniyat*) and not a name, His Eminence should have named his son after one of

the real names of Abu Bakr: That is Abdul Kaaba, Ateeq, Abdullah or his other names (with attention to differences, which exist with regard to his names) and he would not chosen his *Kunniyat*.

Another point is that: What attention to the fact that Abu Bakr is a *Kunniyat* and not a name, and *Kunniyat* is chosen by a person himself according to the circumstances of his life and it is not selected by the father of that person. From this aspect, if we say that Amirul Momineen (a) named one of his sons as Abu Bakr it would be a false and baseless statement.

Finally: According to a report the real name of this son, whose *Kunniyat* was Abu Bakr, was Abdullah and he was martyred at Kerbala aged twenty-five years. Since his real name was Abdullah and from the aspect that he had a son named Bakr they referred to him as Abu Bakr.

Abul Faraj Isfahani writes:

> Abdullah bin Ali was twenty-five years of age when he was martyred in Kerbala.[1]

On the basis of this, the birth of Abdullah occurred during the early period of the Caliphate of His Eminence, Ali (a) and the Imam during that period severely condemned the Caliphs preceding him. This is another proof of the absence of relation between these names with that, which is publicized by the objection makers.

C. Naming as Umar

With regard to naming of a son of Amirul Momineen (a) as Umar:

1- Firstly: One of the habits of Umar was that he used to change the names of people. Thus, according to historians, he changed the names of many people.

Balazari has written in *Ansabul Ashraf*:

> Umar bin Khattab named the son of Ali after himself.[2]

In the same way, Dhahabi has written in *Seer Alaamun Nubla:*

> A son was born to Ali (a) during the period of Umar bin Khattab and the latter named the child after his own name.[3]

For further emphasis, I would present the example of three other persons, whose names were changed by Umar:

A- Ibrahim bin Harith

Abdur Rahman bin Harith was named by his father as Ibrahim, whose name Umar changed to Abdur Rahman.[4]

B- Ajda Abi Masruq

Umar bin Khattab changed the name of Ajda bin Malik to Abdur Rahman.[5]

C- Thalaba bin Saad

The name of Mualla was Thalaba; Umar changed it to Mualla.[6]

2- Supposing we don't accept the previous statement as was also mentioned in the beginning, can it be said that this naming was due to the attachment of Amirul Momineen (a) to Umar bin Khattab and only his name was Umar?

Ibne Hajar has mentioned in *Isabah,* 'Chapter of those named as Umar', twenty-one persons among companions of the Prophet who were named as Umar.[7]

How and according to which evidence was this naming due to the attachment to Umar bin Khattab?

D. Naming as Uthman

Firstly: As was hinted before also, it is not necessary that only these persons were having those names and it was not due to attachment to them, because naming as Uthman was not after the third Caliph or due to attachment with him, on the contrary, His Eminence himself clarified that it was due to

attachment with Uthman bin Mazun and not Uthman bin Affan, the third Ahle Sunnat Caliph.

I named my son on the name of my brother, Uthman bin Mazun.[8]

Furthermore, Ibne Hajar Asqalani has mentioned the names of twenty-six persons from the companions of the Prophet who were named as Uthman. How can it be said that Amirul Momineen (a) named one of his sons Uthman due to his attachment to Uthman bin Affan, the third Ahle Sunnat Caliph?

POLEMICAL REPLIES

A. Names like Yazid, Muawiyah and Shimr among Shia

There is no doubt that some Shia were and are extremely hateful to Yazid bin Muawiyah and his evil deeds; but at the same time we see that among Shia and companions of the Holy Imams (a) there are persons named as Yazid.

Among companions of the Holy Imams (a) we find the names of:

Yazid bin Hatim a companion of Imam Sajjad (a), Yazid bin Abdul Malik, Yazid Saigh, Yazid Kunnasi among the companions of Imam Muhammad Baqir (a); Yazid Sher, Yazid bin Khalifa, Yazid bin Khalil, Yazid bin Umar bin Talha, Yazid bin Farqad and Yazid, the freed slave of Hakam among the companions of Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a); so much that one of the companions of Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a) was named Shimr bin Yazid.[9] Now, can it be said that these namings were due to the attachment of Shia with Yazid bin Muawiyah and Shimr bin Ziljaushan?

Or for example, before the Islamic revolution of Iran a large number of people had named themselves as Muhammad Reza, can anyone say that it was due to attachment and good relations with Muhammad Reza Pahlavi, the former dethroned Shah of Iran, that they named their sons after him?

If the naming was to express fondness for the personalities why the second Caliph issued a proclamation that no one has the right to name any of his children on names of prophets, including the Messenger of Allah (s)?

Ibne Battal and Ibne Hajar in their commentaries of *Sahih Bukhari* have mentioned:

> Umar ordered the people of Kufa not to name their children after any of the prophets.[10]

Aini has stated in *Umdatul Qari:*

> Umar ordered the people of Kufa not to name their children on the Prophet. In the same way, he ordered some people of Medina, except some companions of Prophet to change the names of their children who were initially named Muhammad and they did so.[11]

B. A name like Amr for a son of Imam Mujtaba (a)

According to the narration of Shaykh Mufeed, the name of one of the sons of Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a) was Amr. Can it be said that this was due to its similarity with the name of Amr bin Abde Wadd or Amr bin Hisham, which was the actual name of Abu Jahl[12]?

C. One-sided friendship?!

For those who claim that these namings were due to good relations of Amirul Momineen (a) with Caliphs, the reply is that if it was as such, why this friendship was one-sided and the Caliphs did not name their children as Ali, Hasan, Husain, Fatima, who were also the Ahle Bayt (a) of the Messenger of Allah (s)? Can friendship be one-sided?

The conclusion is that the selection of these names cannot be considered to have been on the names of Caliphs and indicate their attachment with persons under question and proof of good relation and denial of martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s).

NOTES

[1] *Maqatilut Talibiyyin*, Vol. 1, Pg. 22, Abul Faraj Ali bin Husain Isfahani (d. 356).

[2] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 1, Pg. 297, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.).

[3] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 4, Pg. 134, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[4] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 5, Pg. 29, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[5] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 1, Pg. 186, No. 425, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[6] *Al-Ansab*, Vol. 1, Pg. 250, Abul Manzar Salma bin Muslim bin Ibrahim Sahari Autabi (d. 511 A.H.)

[7] *Al-Isabah fee Tamizus Sahaba*, Vol. 4, Pg. 587-597, Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Abul Fazl Asqalani Shafei (d. 854), Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi, Darul Jeel – Beirut, First edition, 1412 – 1992.

[8] *Maqatilut Talibiyyin*, Vol. 1, Pg. 23, Abul Faraj Ali bin Husain Isfahani (d. 356).

[9] *Jamiur Ruwaat Wazahatuk Istibahaat an Tarq wal Asnad*, Vol. 1, Pg. 402, Muhammad bin Ali Ardebeli Gharvi, (d. 1101 A.H.), Maktaba Muhammadi.

[10] *Sharh Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 9, Pg. 344, Abdul Hasan Ali bin Khalaf bin Abdul Malik Ibne Battal Bakri Qurtubi (d. A.H.), Edited: Abu Tamim Yasir bin Ibrahim, Maktabe Rushd – Saudia/Riyadh, 2nd Edition, 1423 A.H. – 2003 A.D.

Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 10, Pg. 572, Abul Fadhl Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut – 1379, Edited: Muhibuddin Khatib.

[11] *Umdatul Qari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 15, Pg. 39, Badruddin Mahmud bin Ahmad Aini (d. 855 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[12] *Al-Irshad fee Marifat Hujajullah Alal Ibaad*, Vol. 2, Pg. 20

Chapter of the male children of Hasan bin Ali (a). Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Noman Ibne Muallim Abi Abdullah Akbari Shaykh Mufeed Baghdadi (d. 413 A.H.), Edited: Mausisa Aalul Bayt (a) li Tahqiqut Turath, Darul Mufeed Lit Taba wan Nashat wa Tauzih – Beirut – Lebanon, Second edition, 1414 A.H. – 1993 A.D.

OBJECTION 13: WHY BEFORE YEAR 71, THE TERM OF MARTYRDOM WAS NOT PRESENT IN THE CALENDAR?

PATTERN OF OBJECTION

Wahabis have stated in one of their objections as follows:

In 1371 A.H., after nearly 1400 years, the Majlis Shura Islamic (Iranian Parliament) suddenly discovered an important secret: that Lady Fatima Zahra (s) did not die a natural death, on the contrary, she was martyred. It was this point that members of the parliament announced that now the word of martyrdom would be mentioned instead of demise and declared a holiday on this day and through this step they rendered the greatest blow to the unity of Islam.

LOGICAL REPLY

In reply to this weak and baseless objection, it is necessary to pay attention to two important points:

A. Demise: It is a common word for natural death and martyrdom

Demise is a word, which includes natural death and martyrdom.

This topic is also found in instances like the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (a), Imam Husain (a), Ja'far Tayyar (a), His Eminence, Hamza, chief of the martyrs and also with regard to the second and third Ahle Sunnat Caliphs.

Whereas no one has claimed regarding Amirul Momineen (a), Imam Husain (a), Ja'far Tayyar and His Eminence, Hamza, chief of the martyrs that they died a natural death.

B. Using the special word of 'demise' in the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (a)

In a large number of Shia and Sunni traditional sources, it is seen that the word of 'demise; is used in connection with the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (a). For example:

Imam Husain (a), after the passing away of his father, lived with his brother, Imam Hasan (a) for ten years and another ten years after that.[1]

Is the implication of the above statement that Amirul Momineen (a) was not martyred by the sword? And that he died in his bed?

Although the same topic is found in Ahle Sunnat traditional reports, but due to its importance in Shia books we are content only to mention it.

C. Use of the term of 'demise' in martyrdom of Imam Husain (a)

The same topic is repeated regarding the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a).

Tabarsi, in his *Ihtijaj*, has used the term of 'demise' regarding the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a):

> Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah after the demise of his brother, Husain bin Ali (a)...[2]

Or that Ibne Sharh Ashob, in his book, has narrated a traditional report from the Messenger of Allah (s) that His Eminence used the term of 'passing away' in connection with the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a).

The Messenger of Allah (s) said regarding Imam Husain (a):

> Know that, very soon my Ummah would slay Husain; for whoever performs his Ziyarat after his 'passing away', the Almighty Allah would write the reward of one Hajj of mine.[3]

Other instances are also there regarding Hamza, chief of martyrs and Ja'far Tayyar, but we have refrained from their mention for sake of brevity. Now, can anyone say that these persons were not martyred and they died a natural death?

D. History of Shia is accompanied with mourning for the martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s)

Throughout history, Shia have observed the rituals mourning during *Ayyam Fatimiya* (Days of Fatima) in accordance with the martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s) and after the Islamic Revolution also, these rituals were observed in the houses of supreme jurisprudents (*Maraja Taqlid*), Founder of the Islamic Republic and respected Leader of revolution and since the past to the present age such a statement is not at all mentioned in these gatherings.

E. Statements of Imam Khomeini (r) is another testimony for refutation of these objections

Statements of Imam Khomeini (r), whether before the revolution or after it are also testimonies to refute the objection makers. With reference to the archives of statement of the late Imam (r) it is seen that he has on many occasions used the term of martyrdom. For example Imam Khomeini (r) dated 18 Asfand, year 1360 A.H. corresponding to 13th Jamadi I, year 1402 A.H. in his speech, said as follows:

> I present my condolences on the martyrdom of the great lady of Islam to all Muslims, to you, my dear brothers in Air force, Army and Navy and to His Eminence, Baqiyatullah (our souls be sacrificed on him).[4]

Polemical reply: Did Umar bin Khattab die?

Ahle Sunnat have consensus that the second Caliph was killed at the hands of Abu Lulu (r), but we see that in their books they have always used the word of 'demise; with regard to

Umar. Does it disprove the killing of Umar at the hands of Abu Lulu and that Umar was not killed; on the contrary, he died in his bed?

Balazari says in *Ansabul Ashraf*:

> Fatima, the daughter of Umar bin Khattab, after the death of Umar...[5]

Tabari has written in his *Tarikh*:

> It is said that the conquest of Rayy, was two years before the demise of Umar.[6]

So much so that Haithami, in his book, has written a chapter entitled: 'Chapter of the demise of Umar'.[7]

There are many other instances as well, which we haven't mentioned for the sake of brevity.

Supposing it is so, can the calendar have the power to judge the correctness or incorrectness of facts or beliefs? In spite of genuine traditional reports having correct chains of narrators, some of which were mentioned in the first part of this book, can a conclusion derived through such reasoning have any value and reliability?

Finally, especially in the last part of the statement of objection makers, who consider the mention of this discussion to be 'the greatest blow to Islamic unity', we say: For awareness about the correct meaning of unity and other points regarding this refer to the preface and first and second chapters of the book, *Shakh Shaitan* (criticism and research on beliefs of deviated Wahabi sect in seven parts) by the same author.

NOTES

[1] *Kashful Ghumma fee Marifatul Aaimma*, Vol. 2, Pg. 250, Abul Hasan Ali bin Isa bin Abil Fath Irbili (d. 693 A.H.), Darul Azwa, Beirut, Second edition, 1405 A.H. – 1985 A.D.

Biharul Anwar, Vol. 44, Pg. 200, Muhammad Baqir Majlisi (d. 1111 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Baqir Bahbudi, Mausasul Wafa – Beirut – Lebanon, Second corrected edition, 1403 – 1983 A.D.

[2] *Al-Ihtijaj*, Vol. 2, Pg. 136, Abu Mansur Ahmad bin Ali bin Abu Talib Tabarsi (d. 548 A.H.), Edited with notes: Sayyid Muhammad Baqir Khorasan, Darun Noman Lit Taba-a wan Nashr – Najaf Ashraf, 1386 A.H. 1966 A.D.

[3] *Manaqib Aale Abi Talib*, Vol. 3, Pg. 272, Shiruddin Abi Abdullah Muhammad bin Ali Mazandarani Ibne Shahr Ashob (d. 588 A.H.), Maktana wa Matba Haidariya – Najaf, 1345 A.H.

[4] *Sahifa Noor*, Imam Khomeini, Vol. 16, Pg. 87, Speech dated 18-12/1360

[5] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 2, Pg. 257, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.)

[6] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 536, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.

[7] *Majamuz Zawaid wa Manbaul Fawaid*, Vol. 9, Pg. 74, Ali bin Abu Bakr Haithami (d. 807 A.H.), Darul Riyan Lilturath/Dar Kitab al-Arabi – Cairo, - Beirut – 1407

OBJECTION 14:
HOUSES OF MECCA AND MEDINA WERE NOT HAVING DOORS

EXPLANATION

Of all the doubts, which are spread by Wahabism and regretfully by some people who do not have the necessary knowledge of history it is repeated that originally during the early period of Islam, houses in Mecca and Medina did not have wooden doors like today and people used only curtains or mats in order to screen the house from strangers and unrelated persons. Some of them, in order to prove their claim, use reasoning through traditional reports:

> "It is narrated from Ali (r) that he said: And we are Ahle Bayt of Muhammad. Our houses neither have roof nor door..."[1]

So they conclude: How it is possible for Fatima to come between the door and the wall? Thus, the issue of burning of the door of Fatima and crushing her between the wall and the half-burnt door is false.

LOGICAL REPLY

By study of the reports present in books of Shia and Sunni it can be concluded that during the period of the Messenger of Allah (s) houses in Medina were having wooden doors.

To prove the point, it is possible to reason through numerous evidences and those interested in details may refer to detailed books on this subject.[2]

A. Clarification of Quran that houses should have doors and doors should have lock and key

While numerous verses of the Holy Quran have clarified the existence of doors for houses, how can we deny the existence

of doors in the early period of Islam? For example the following verse:

> "...and it is not righteousness that you should enter the houses at their backs, but righteousness is this that one should guard (against evil); and go into the houses by their doors." (Surah Baqarah 2:189)

In the above verse, the existence of door in the house is clarified.

Or the following verse of the Holy Quran, in which it says:

> "...from your houses, or your fathers' houses... or what you possess the keys of, or your friends' (houses). It is no sin in you that you eat together or separately." (Surah Nur 24:61)

In the above verse, Allah, the Mighty and the High allows persons having keys to houses to enter those houses and eat from there; without any doubt, how can houses not having wooden or iron doors, on the contrary, according to the claim of objection maker, having only a curtain or mat screen, have keys?

B. Clarification of traditional reports about the presence of doors in houses

Some traditions, like the one mentioned below, talk of unlocking the door with keys and this shows that houses and rooms of that period were having doors:

It is narrated from Dukain bin Saeed Muzni: I went to the Holy Prophet (s) and requested him for food. The Prophet said to Umar: Go and give food to them. Umar took us to the room upstairs; then he removed the key from his waist band and opened the door.[3]

Albani in the book, *Sahih wa Zaeef Sunan Abi Dawood*, no. 5238 has corrected this report.

In the same way, the report, which Muslim has narrated in his *Sahih* is also proof that house had doors during the early period of Islam.

Abu Hamid says: The Prophet commanded us to place containers of water in a corner and latch the doors at night.[4]

C. Door of the Prophet's House

Ibne Kathir Damishqi, quoting from Hasan Basri, says regarding the door of the Prophet's house:

> Rooms of the Messenger of Allah (s) were constructed by fastening branches of juniper tree together with thick hair. It is mentioned in *Tarikh Bukhari* that the door of the Prophet was knocked with finger tips and nails and this proves that there was no ring for knocking.[5]

The above text is evidence that houses of that period were having doors.

D. Door of the house of Amirul Momineen (a)

In numerous Shia and Sunni traditional reports there is mention of the door of the house of Amirul Momineen (a). For example, in the description of the marriage of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) with Amirul Momineen (a), it is mentioned as follows:

> The Messenger of Allah (s) summoned Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) and recited the same rituals and supplications for Ali (a), which he had recited for Lady Fatima (s)...after these supplications the Messenger of Allah (s) stood up and closed the door.[6]

E. Door of Ayesha's house

Bukhari, in the book of *Abadbul Mufarrad,* has written about the door of Ayesha's house:

> It is narrated from Muhammad bin Hilal that he saw that the chambers of the wives of the Prophet (s) were

> having knitted fur coverings. I asked him about the door of Ayesha's house. He said: Her door opens to Shaam. I asked: Did it have single or double flap? He replied: It did not have more than a single flap. I said: What was it made of? He replied: It was made from wood of juniper or teak.[7]

Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari has written in his *Sahih*:

> It is narrated from Ayesha that: When report of martyrdom of Ja'far bin Abu Talib and Abdullah bin Rawaha arrived; the Prophet sat on the ground and signs of grief became apparent from his face and I watched him from the crack in the door.[8]

Crack or hole in the door proves our claim that houses were not without doors, on the contrary, doors were made from wooden planks of trees or trunks of date trees.

F. Reply to the traditional report presented by the objection makers

As for the traditional report attributed to Amirul Momineen (a) that: 'Our houses do not have either roof or door', it is necessary to mention the following points:

Firstly: Ahmad bin Husain bin Saeed is included in the chain of reporters of this traditional report and that person is unreliable and this makes the report defective (*Mursal*) and unreliable.

More important than this is the fact that the objection maker has mentioned the report in a defective manner; in such way that the reader feels that the houses of Ahle Bayt (a) were not having doors or imagines that their houses did not have the usual form. While the fact is that basically it is impossible to imagine houses sans doors, ceiling and walls?!

The complete text of the tradition, without this distortion is as follows: We are the Ahle Bayt of Muhammad, there are no

roofs for our houses and neither there are doors and curtains, except palm leaves and branches. From this report, it is not concluded that the house of Ahle Bayt (a) do not have doors, on the contrary, it can be concluded from the last words of this report that the roof, doors and walls of our houses are made of date trunks. This report in fact says: "Roof and door of house of us Ahle Bayt (a) is made of date trunks."

NOTES

[1] *Al-Khisaal*, Shaykh Saduq, Pg. 382; *Sharh al-Akhbar*, Qadi Noman Maghribi, Vol. 1, Pg. 362; *Al-Ikhtisaas*, Shaykh Mufeed, Pg. 163 and *Biharul Anwar*, Allamah Majlisi, Vol. 38, Pg. 167.

[2] Those interested in details can refer to two books: *Masaatuz Zahra* and *Khalfiyaat Masaatuz Zahra* by the great Allamah, Sayyid Ja'far Murtaza Jabal Amili.

[3] *Sunan Abi Dawood*, Vol. 2, Pg. 527, Tr. 5240, Sulaiman bin Ashath Abu Dawood Sajistani Azdi (d. 275 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Mohiuddin Abdul Hamid, Darul Fikr.

[4] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1593, Tr. 2010, Kitabul Ashraba (wal Ata-ama), Baab fee Sharb Nabidh wa Takhmiril Anaa, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[5] *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 3, Pg. 221, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Abul Fida Qarashi Damishqi (d. 774 A.H.), Maktabul Marif – Beirut.

[6] *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 5, Pg. 489, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr al-Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[7] *Al-Adabul Mufarrad*, Vol. 1, Pg. 272, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Bashairul Islamiya, Beirut, 3rd edition 1409 (1989).

[8] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 440, Tr. no. 1243, Baab Maa Yanha An Nuh wal baka wa Zajari An Dhaalik, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

OBJECTION 15:
UMAR ONLY THREATENED AND DID NOTHING ELSE

EXPLANATION

One of the objections of the Wahabis is as follows:

The ultimate point mentioned in the report is that Lady Zahra (r) was threatened by Umar; and with a threat, which was for the welfare of Islam and Muslim society.

In none of the reports is there clarification that this threat was put into practice; and if issuing a threat is a crime then the threat of the Messenger of Allah (s) to those who opposed participation in congregational prayers would also be a crime, as it is narrated from the Messenger of Allah (s) that he said:

> "By Him in Whose Hands my life is, I was about to order for collecting fire wood and then order someone to pronounce the Adhan for the prayer and then order someone to lead the people in prayer and then I would go from behind and burn the houses of men who did not present themselves for the (compulsory congregational) prayer. By Him in Whose Hands my life is, if anyone of you had known that he would receive a bone covered with meat or two (small) pieces of meat present in between two ribs, he would come for `Isha' prayer."[1]

No sane person would conclude anything more than that the Messenger of Allah (s) only threatened those who opposed congregational prayer and he only aimed to announce the importance of congregational prayer. Thus, Umar also issued a threat and to consider it more than this is unjust and a consequence of bias.

LOGICAL REPLY

In reply, we say that the analogy of this report to numerous reports on the subject of attacking the house of revelation is defective; because there is no similarity between the threat to burn down the house of Lady Zahra (s) and threats of the Messenger of Allah (s) to the opponents of congregational prayers mentioned in the above reports, because:

First of all, this report is mentioned in non-Shia sources, hence it cannot be a proof for us;

Secondly, the purport of the report, which is used in the argumentation of Wahabis is unacceptable; because it is unlikely from the good ethical behavior of the Prophet that he should threaten burning down houses of people for recommended acts. Using threats of burning down houses for a recommended act is not compatible with the spirit of the original Shariat;

Thirdly: In reports of threat of Umar to burn down the house of revelation according to the report of Tabari and Ibne Abi Shaybah, Umar swore that if the persons gathered in the house of Amirul Momineen (a) do not come to pay allegiance, I would burn down the house with its occupants. Clarification and emphasis of Lady Zahra (s) in putting the threat into practice by Umar is itself testimony to the definite intention of Umar to burn down the house of revelation.[2]

On the other hand it is definite that Amirul Momineen (a) did not pay any heed to the threats of Umar and he did not present himself for allegiance[3] and this is another proof with reference to the absence of allegiance of Amirul Momineen (a) that Umar must definitely have put his threat of burning the house into practice.

Further evidence was report of Balazari that was previously narrated through correct authorities and in that report it is clearly explained that the house of revelation was indeed burnt down by Umar.[4]

Fourthly: As mentioned previously, swearing of Umar that he would burn down the house with its occupants was definite since he swore and then put into practice the purport of the oath thus proving the stand of Shia for if he had not fulfilled that oath it would have been obligatory on him to pay the penalty for breaking of an oath, while the fact is that no report, even a weak one exists that Umar gave *Kaffara* (penalty) for breaking his oath.

Fifthly: Umar put his threat into practice; because Abu Bakr who had issued the orders of burning down the house of revelation in his last days expressed regret at the cruelty of this act.[5]

Sixthly: Masudi Shafei in his book, *Kitab Asbatul Wasiyya* has clarified that Umar put the house on fire.[6]

Seventhly: Even if the supposition of the Wahabis is accepted and we say that Umar only threatened, the same threat is sufficient enough to put a question mark over the Caliphate of the three Caliphs, because it proves that Lady Zahra (s), Amirul Momineen (a), Bani Hashim and some companions of the Prophet were opposed to the Caliphate of Abu Bakr and this issue also puts a question mark on the fiction of consensus on the allegiance of Abu Bakr.

NOTES

[1] *Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 1, Page. 231, Tr. 2865; Kitab al-Jama-a wal Imamah, Baab Wujub Salatil Jama-a, ...

[2] By Allah, gathering of these people will not prevent the burning down of this house. When Umar went away, Ali (a) and Zubair returned to the house. The respected daughter of the Prophet said to Ali and Zubair: Umar came to me and swore that if you again hold a meeting here, he would burn down the house on you; by Allah he would indeed do what he has sworn.

Al-Kitabul Musannaf fil Ahadith wal Aathaar, Vol. 7, Pg. 432, Tr. 37045, Kitabul Maghazi, Baab Maa Jaa fil Khilafah Abu Bakr wal Seerah fil Ridda, Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad Ibne Abi Shabah Kufi (d. 235 A.H.), Edited: Kamaal Yusuf Alhut; Maktabe Rushd, Riyadh, First edition, 1409 A.H.

[3] Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari writes:

Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle...'Ali had not given the oath of allegiance (to Abu Bakr) during those (six) months.

Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari), Vol. 4, Pg. 1549, Tr. no. 3998, Kitabul Maghazi, Baab Ghuzwa Khaibar, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

Sahih Muslim, Vol. 3, Pg. 1380, Tr. no. 1759, Kitabul Jihad was Sayr, Baab Qaulan Nabi Laa Nooritha, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[4] Since Ali (a) did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar came to the house of Fatima with fire (a burning torch). Fatima came behind the door and asked: Fatima came behind the door of the house and called: O son of Khattab, do you want to burn down the door of my house? Umar replied: Yes.

Ansabul Ashraf, Vol. 1, Pg. 252, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.).

[5] I do not regret anything in the world, except three things, which I

did and three things, which I did not do and three things, which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah (s): I wish I had not trespassed against the house of Fatima even though it might have been closed up for fighting...

Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 353, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari, (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.

Tarikh al-Islam wa Wafyatul Mashahir wal Aalaam, Vol. 3, Pg. 118, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman Dhahabi, (d. 748 A.H.), Darul Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, Beirut, 1407 A.H. – 1987 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Umar Abdus Salam Tadmiri;

[6] ...so they headed to the house of Ali and besieged it and set his house on fire and brought him out of the house forcibly. They crushed the chief of the ladies (Fatima) between the wall and the door causing the miscarriage of Mohsin, her unborn child.

Asbatul Wasiyya, Pg. 143, Abul Hasan Ali bin Husain bin Ali Masudi (d. 346 A.H.).

OBJECTION 16:
ALI (A) CONCEDED HIS RIGHT; WHY YOU SHIA DO NOT CONCEDE IT?

It is mentioned as follows in this objection of Wahabis:

If according to the claim of Shia, rightfulness was with Ali (a), Ali himself conceded it; now, why you Shia do not concede it like Ali (a)?

LOGICAL REPLY

This objection can be studied from two angles:

1- Amirul Momineen (a) conceding his right.

2- Followers of Ali (a) and defenders of the school of Ahle Bayt (a) should have remained silent and must not have defended their rightful religion and beliefs.

Amirul Momineen (a) and the Caliphate of the Caliphs

Stance of Amirul Momineen (a) to the Caliphs is clearly mentioned and identified in history in numerous discussions; even though the initial usurpation of Caliphate was through efforts to erase, distort and conceal the facts, but despite this, through the miracle of Ahle Bayt (a), numerous facts yet remain in the books of opponents and have reached us.[1]

Traditional sources and historical records are replete with the protests and objections of Amirul Momineen Imam Ali (a) addressed to the nominees of Saqifah.

Muslim has narrated in his *Sahih*:

> Umar bin Khattab addressed Abbas and Amirul Momineen Ali (a) and said:
>
> When the Messenger of Allah (peace be on him) passed away, Abu Bakr said: "I am the successor of the

> Messenger of Allah (peace be on him)." Both of you came to demand your shares from the property (left behind by the Messenger of Allah). (Referring to His Eminence, Abbas), he said: You demanded your share from the property of your nephew, and he (referring to Ali) demanded a share on behalf of his wife from the property of her father. Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him) said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be on him) had said: "We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity." So both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest. And Allah knows that he was true, virtuous, well-guided and a follower of truth. When Abu Bakr passed away and (I have become) the successor of the Messenger of Allah (peace be on him) and Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him), you thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest...[2]

In this quotation, according to the personal admission of Umar, Amirul Momineen (a) considered the first and the second Caliphs to be liars, dishonest, deceptive and sinners. On the basis of this, can it be claimed that Amirul Momineen (a) conceded his right and put up no objection and opposition?

The matter does not end here and there are other instances as well of the same confession mentioned in the most authentic books of Ahle Sunnat after the Holy Quran. For example Amirul Momineen Ali (a) addressed Abu Bakr thus:

> "...we have got a right in it due to our near relationship to Allah's Apostle." Thereupon Abu Bakr's eyes flowed with tears. Ali added, "But we used to consider that we too had some right in this affair (of rulership) and that he (i.e. Abu Bakr) did not consult us in this matter, and therefore, caused us to feel sorry."[3]

Can opposition and objection be clearer than this that His Eminence with all daring and bravery rejected the condition of transfer of Caliphate, which was according to the practice of Abu Bakr and Umar and declared unlawfulness of their practice? Taftazani says in *Sharh Maqasid*:

> [On the last day of the life of Umar and in six-member Shura committee] discretion was given to Abdur Rahman bin Auf. He took the hand of Ali (a) and asked: Do you accept Caliphate on the condition that you will act on the Book of Allah, practice of the Prophet and practice of Abu Bakr and Umar? Ali (a) replied: I accept Caliphate on the basis of the Book of Allah, practice of the Prophet and on my personal view and jurisprudence. After that Abdur Rahman mentioned the same conditions to Uthman and he accepted. Abdur Rahman repeated this statement three times and he heard the same reply. So he paid allegiance to Uthman and people paid allegiance to him and were pleased at his Caliphate.[4]

Tabari has also said in his *Tarikh*:

> When Khawarij staged an uprising in Kufa, Shia and followers of Ali (a) came to him, paid allegiance to him and said: We are friends to all you befriend and inimical to all your enemies. Ali (a) put a condition to them to act according to the practice of the Holy Prophet (s). Rabia bin Abu Shaddad – who was present in the battles of Jamal and Siffeen as the standard bearer of Khatham tribe, came to the Imam. Ali (a) said: O Khatham, give allegiance on the basis of the Book of Allah and practice of His Prophet. Khatham said: I give allegiance on the basis of practice of Abu Bakr and Umar. Ali (a) said: Woe be on you, if Abu Bakr and Umar had acted against the practice of the Messenger of Allah (s), they have no right.[5]

When Amirul Momineen (a) did not accept the practice of Abu Bakr and Umar, how Wahabis claim that he conceded his right, paid allegiance to them and considered them as Caliphs of the Messenger of Allah (s)?

But in reply to the second part of objection, it should be said:

When it becomes clear that His Eminence never conceded and lost no opportunity in defending his usurped rights, it is necessary for the Shia of His Eminence also that in following their Imam and Master they should not fall short in explaining the facts.

On the other hand, we ask: Why Wahabis do not concede and do not refrain from audacity, threats, distortion, destruction, verdicts of infidelity on Shia and slaying them?

On the basis of this, it would be inappropriate for you to expect the Shia to keep quiet and refrain from stating the facts.

NOTES

[1] Some steps of the first and second Caliph in censoring and controlling the traditions of the Prophet and order of prohibition of narrating traditions of the Prophet and their burning down can be studied in the fourth part of the book of *Adaab Manzira ba Wahabism* (collection of ethical, technical and specialized rules in discussions and debates based on four chapters, Pg. 325 and verso page) from the same author.

[2] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1378, Tr. no. 1757, Kitabul Jihad wa Sayr, Baab Hukm al-Fayy, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari), Vol. 5, Pg. 2049, Tr. no. 5043, Kitabul Nafaqaat, Baab 3, Baab Habsi Nafqatur Rajul, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[3] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1549, Tr. no. 3998, Book no. 67, Kitabal Maghazi, Baab 36, Baab Ghuzwa Khyber, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

In another report, which has come in *Sahih Bukhari* and *Muslim*, Amirul Momineen Ali (a) sent someone to Abu Bakr saying, "Come to us, but let nobody come with you," as he disliked that Umar should come. Umar said (to Abu Bakr), "No, by Allah, you shall not enter upon them alone "

Ali (a) sent for Abu Bakr to meet him alone, but said as we don't like the presence of Umar in our gathering don't not bring anyone with you. When Umar came to know about this he adjured Abu Bakr not to meet Amirul Momineen (a) alone.

Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari), Vol. 4, Pg. 1549, Tr. no. 3998, Kitabul Maghazi, Baab 36, Baab Ghuzwa Khyber, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[4] *Sharh Maqasid fee Ilmul Kalam*, Vol. 2, Pg. 296, Saaduddin

Masud bin Umar bin Abdullah Taftazani (d. 791 A.H.), Darul Marif Nomaniya – Pakistan, First edition – 1401 A.H. 1981 A.D.

[5] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 3, Pg. 116, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari, (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.

OBJECTION 17:
SHIA CONSIDER THEIR OPPONENTS TO BE OF ILLEGITIMATE BIRTH

PATTERN OF OBJECTION

Lastly, Uthman Khamis, Wahabi[1] during the course of his speech in Friday Prayers in Kuwait has laid many accusations on Shia, including the allegation that Shia only consider themselves as legitimate and consider other Muslims as illegitimate. He has said as follows in his speech:

> Shia say that non-Shia are infidels; on the contrary, they also go on to say that they (non-Shia) are illegitimate born. Shia support their statement with a tradition of Imam Muhammad Baqir (a) mentioned in *Al-Kafi*, that he said: Other than our Shia, all are illegitimate.[2]

LOGICAL REPLY

The Late Kulaini in his book of *Usul Kafi* has quoted this report, which we mentioned in the footnote as follows:

> Abu Hamza says: I asked Imam Muhammad Baqir (a) some of our co-religionists accuse people of other sects as liars and label them as illegitimate born. Imam Muhammad Baqir (a) said: It is better not to say anything about them. Then he said: O Abu Hamza, by God, except for our Shia, all people are illegitimate born.[3]

WEAKNESS OF THE CHAIN OF AUTHORITIES

Firstly: There are two difficulties in the chain of the authorities of this report. One is Hasan bin Abdur Rahman and the other is Ali bin Abbas.

Hasan bin Abdur Rahman is unknown and no Shia book of *Rijal* (science of narrators) has approved him. Therefore, his reports are not reliable.

More basic difficulty of the chain of narrators is that he was from the extremists (*Ghulat*) [Those who attribute divinity to a member of Ahle Bayt (a)].

The Late Najjashi has written about him as follows:

> Ali bin Abbas Jaradheeni Raazi is an extremely unreliable reporter whose reports have been ignored due to his extremist views.[4]

On the basis of this, reports of such people have no value in the Shia faith, hence neither throughout history not one of the Shia scholars have issued verdict according to this report; on the contrary, they have issued verdict against it; because according to principles of Shia jurisprudence all who marry on the basis of their religion and recite marriage formula, all their issues are considered legitimate; even non-Muslims. So what can be said about Muslims?

This traditional report, in addition of being weak in view of Shia jurisprudence is also having contradiction.

Secondly: There are many traditional reports in Ahle Sunnat books, which prove that one who does not have love for Amirul Momineen (a) is illegitimate, some of which we shall mention in the coming chapter:[5]

POLEMICAL REPLIES: THE SAME TRADITIONAL REPORT IN AHLE SUNNAT TRADITIONAL SOURCES

A. Enmity to Amirul Momineen (a) is a sign of illegitimate birth

Allamah Shamsuddin Jazari Shafei, a senior Ahle Sunnat scholar, who has introduced the reports of his book as authentic and widely related (*Mutawatir*),[6] writes as follows:

Ubadah bin Samit says: We companions tested our children in love for Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a). If one of them did not have love for Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) we realized that he was of illegitimate birth...the same report is narrated through Abu Saeed Khudri in the following words: We, migrants (*Ansar*) examined our children in love for Ali (a); if we gave birth to a child who did not love Ali (a), we came to know that he was not from us.[7]

Perhaps some may create doubt about the book of *Asniul Matalib* and its author, Allamah Jazari in the minds of others; therefore, we quote a statement of Ibne Hajar Asqalani, who is regarded by all Ahle Sunnat as *Hafiz* (memorizer of traditions) so that every kind of doubt regarding his personality in view of Ahle Sunnat scholars is removed. He writes:

> ...in all countries, the science of *Qirat* (recitation of Quran) ends with him and he is the writer of the book entitled *Al-Hisne Haseen*. People of Yemen have benefited from him a great deal. He taught *Musnad Ahmad* and *Shafei* in Cairo. He was known by the title of *Imam Aazam* (the great Imam).[8]

An important and interesting point is that the traditional report under discussion has come in some books of grammar also and this shows that the issue is quite famous and has become a part of culture so it is included in the text of experts of language.[9]

B. Love for Amirul Momineen (a) is a sign of legitimate birth

Asimi Makki and Maufiq Khwarizmi write:

> Abu Bakr has narrated that: The Messenger of Allah (s) was seated on an Arabic carpet in a tent; Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain (a) were also present there. His Eminence (s) said: O Muslims, I love those who love

the occupants of this tent and I hate those who hate them. One, who loves them, is of legitimate birth and one who hates them is of illegitimate birth.[10]

Qunduzi Hanafi writes:

Saeed bin Jubair has narrated from Ibne Abbas from the Messenger of Allah (s) that he said to His Eminence, Ali (a): You are the standard bearer and in charge of my Hauze Kauthar...I am the master of the believer men and women and you are the master of those whose master I am. Your lover and friend is not, except one whose birth is legitimate and your enemy is not, but one whose birth is illegitimate.[11]

And he further writes:

The Messenger of Allah (s) said: One, who loves us the family, has thanked the Almighty Allah for His best blessings. They asked: What is the best blessing? His Eminence replied: Legitimacy of birth, because no one loves us, except those having legitimate birth.[12]

Ibne Marduya Isfahani says:

Ahmad bin Hanbal has narrated from Shafei from Malik bin Anas from Anas bin Malik that: We companions did not recognize illegitimate children, except through their hatred to Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a).[13]

And he further writes:

Anas says: After the Battle of Khyber, it became a practice for people to carry their children and stand on the path of Ali (a). When they saw His Eminence they pointed to him and asked the children: My son, do you love this man? If he replied: Yes, they used to kiss him and if he said: No. They used to put him down and say: Go and get related to your mother.[14]

It is possible that someone may doubt that these reports are weak in view of Ahle Sunnat and cannot be a decisive proof for them. We reply: Firstly, the report, which is presented by Wahabis in their objection initially, is in our view weak and unreliable;

Secondly: As we mentioned in the previous chapter,[15] if the chain of these reports is weak, even then they are decisive proofs for Ahle Sunnat, because according to the principle of 'one strengthens the other' if a report is narrated through multiple channels, even if its narrators are sinners, they strengthen each other and become decisive proof for Ahle Sunnat.

C. Satan shares in the seed of the enemies of Amirul Momineen (a)

Qurtubi Ansari, Khatib Baghdadi and Ibne Asakir say:

> Ali (a) said: I saw the Messenger of Allah (s) on Mount Safa that there was a person besides him in shape and form of an elephant and he was cursing him. I asked: O Messenger of Allah (s), who is this? He replied: Shaitan, one driven out from the court of Almighty. I said: O enemy Allah, by Allah, I will indeed eliminate you and save the Ummah from your mischief. He said: By God, my reward from you is not this! I asked: What is your reward from me? He replied: By God, no one has enmity to you, except that I have shared his conception with his father.[16]

D. Judgment Day and recognition of friends and enemies of Amirul Momineen (a)

Abul Hasan Masudi writes in his book, *Murujuz Zahab*:

> Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib says: I was with the Messenger of Allah (s). Ali (a) arrived from somewhere. The face of the Messenger of Allah (s) lit

> up and became happy on seeing Ali (a). I said: O Messenger of Allah (s), you are overjoyed on seeing this youth. He said: O uncle of Messenger of God, by God, Allah loves him more than me. There is no progeny of any prophet, but that it is from his loins and my progeny will also be from his loins. When Judgment Day arrives, the Almighty Allah will call people with their names and names of their mothers, but this youth (Ali) and his followers will be called by their names and names of their fathers, because they are of legitimate births.[17]

It is possible that some people may object to this report and say: The author of the famous book of *Murujuz Zahab* has been accused of being Shia and therefore, his statement is unreliable. The fact is that Ahle Sunnat scholars consider him to be a Shafei scholar and in this way the accusation that he was a Shia is invalid.[18]

As a result of this: Report of the Late Kulaini in *Al-Kafi* is having difficulty from the viewpoint of chains of authorities and there are persons in its chains having extremist religious beliefs. Another point is that if the Late Kulaini has narrated this report, in Ahle Sunnat traditional sources also there are many reports of this kind. The reply that Wahabis will give to these reports, the same reply we will give to the report of *Al-Kafi*.

NOTES

[1] He is the theorist and promoter of true Wahabi view in the present age who wields the sword of enmity to Shia and does not leave any opportunity in this regard. We mention one example of his open enmity to Shia:

In one of his speeches after Friday Prayer in Kuwait, he accused Shia for labeling Ahle Sunnat as disbelievers and it is interesting that he at the end of this same speech has targeted the beliefs of Shia and considered them as Jews and Christians and with all severity has labeled Shia as disbelievers and said as follows:

"...will you not all support our call that all those who have such beliefs cannot be Muslims and do we have no right to say to the Shia that you are non-Muslims? Because these beliefs are not from Islam and it is better that we say religion of Shia, rather the school of Shia; because such religion is not religion of Islam...Ahmad bin Hanbal has said: Shia do not have any place in Islam. Maqdasi has said: It is not concealed on aware people that Shia with all their sects are in ignorance and clear disbelief and they are out of the pale of Islam. Shaukani has said: The foundation of Shia propagations is destruction of religion and opposition to Islam; thus, if any Shia person considers any of the companions of the Prophet as disbeliever, he himself is a disbeliever. So what can be said when the Shia consider all companions of the Prophet to be disbelievers, except only a few. Alusi says: Senior scholars of 'Maawraun Nahr' (across the river) consider Shia to be disbelievers. Bin Baaz has said: Shia who are presently known as Imamiya, Jafariya and supporters of Imam Khomeini are disbelievers and out of the Ummah of Islam..."

Details of this matter and a number of other verdicts of infidelity from Wahabis scholars and Muftis against Shia can be studied in the book of *Shakh Shaitan* (Criticism and research of the beliefs of the deviated sect of Wahabism) by the same author in Part Seven and notes on Pg. 358.

[2] *Rauza Kafi*, Pg. 239

[3] *Al-Usul min Kafi*, Vol. 8, Pg. 275, Tr. 431; Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Yaqub bin Ishaq Kulaini Razi (d. 328 A.H.), Islamiya, Tehran, 2nd Edition, 1362 A.H.

[4] *Fehrist Asmaail Musannafi Shia*, famous as *Rijal Najjashi*, Pg.

255, Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Ali bin Ahmad bin Abbas Najjashi Asadi Kufi (d. 450 A.H.), Edited: Sayyid Musa Shabbiri Zanjani, Mausasatur Nashr Islami, Qom, Fifth edition, 1416.

Ali bin Abbas Jaradhini Raazi is weak and an extremist.

Kitabur Rijal, famous as *Rijal Ibne Dawood*, Page. 261, Taqiuddin Hasan bin Ali bin Dawood Hilli (d. after 707 A.H.), Edited: Sayyid Muhammad Sadiq Aale Bahrul Uloom, Manshurat Matba Haideriya, Najaf, 1392 A.H. 1972 A.D.

Allamah Hilli writes: Ali bin Abbas Jaradhini Raazi is weak and extremist. His writings on praise and condemnation are clear evidences of the destruction of his religion and his decadence. Neither he is having knowledge nor his reports are paid any attention to.

Khulasatur Aqwal fee Marifatu Rijal, Pg. 367, Abi Mansur Hasan bin Yusuf Mutahhar Hilli Asadi (d. 726 A.H.), Edited: Fazilatush Shaykh Jawad Qayyumi, Mausisa Nasharul Fuqaha, First edition, 1417 A.H.

[5] For more details refer to: *Ghadeer*, Vol. 4, Pg. 320 and Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a), Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani, Part 19.

[6] All traditions present in this book are authentic and widely related (*Mutawatir*), which mention the excellence and merits of the ever-victorious lion who, dispersed the armies, displayer of miraculous acts, the valiant lion, Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib so that the Almighty Allah may keep us steadfast on his Wilayat and make us proximate to him.

Asnul Matalib fee Manaqib Sayyidna Ali Ibne Abi Talib, Karramallaahu wajha-hu, Pg. 45, Abul Khair Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Muhammad Jazari Shafei (d. 833 A.H.), Edited and researched: Dr. Muhammad Hadi Amini, Maktabe Al-Imam Amirul Momineen (a) Amina, Isfahan, Iran.

[7] *Asnul Matalib fee Manaqib Sayyidna Ali Ibne Abi Talib, Karramallaahu wajha-hu*, Pg. 57-58, Abul Khair Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Muhammad Jazari Shafei (d. 833 A.H.), Edited and researched: Dr. Muhammad Hadi Amini, Maktabe Al-Imam Amirul Momineen (a) Amma, Isfahan, Iran.

[8] *Anbaul Ghumar Bi Abnail Umar fit Tarikh*, Vol. 8, Pg. 245, Ahmad bin Ali bin Abul Fadhl bin Hajar Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Abdul Moayyad Khan, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya,

Beirut, Lebanon, 2nd edition, 1406 A.H. – 1986 A.D.

[9] *Tahdhibul Lughat*, Vol. 15, Pg. 191, Abu Mansur Muhammad bin Ahmad Azhari (d. 370 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Awz Mar-Abdul, Daar Ahya Turathul Arabi, Beirut, 1st edition, 2001 A.D.;

Al-Nihaya fee Gharibul Hadith wal Asar, Vol. 1, Pg. 161, Abul Sadat Mubarak bin Muhammad Jazari (d. 606 A.H.), Edited: Tahir Ahmad Zaawi – Mahmud Muhammad Tanahi, Maktabal Ilmiya, Beirut, 1399 A.H. – 1979 A.D.;

Lisanul Arab, Vol. 4, Pg. 87, Muhammad bin Mukarram bin Manzur Afriqi Misri (d. 711 A.H.), Daar Sadir, Beirut, 1st edition;

Tajul Uroos min Jawahiral Qamus, Vol. 10, Pg. 257, Muhammad Murtaza Husain Zubaidi (d. 1205 A.H.), Edited: Majmua min Muhaqqaqeen, Daarul Hidaya.

[10] *Simtul Nujum al-Awali fee Anbail Awail wat Tawali*, Vol. 3, Pg. 44, Abdul Malik bin Husain Abdul Malik Shafei Asimi Makki, (d. 1111 A.H.), Edited: Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud – Ali Muhammad Maudh, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1419 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[11] *Yanabiul Mawaddah Li Zawil Qurba*, Vol. 1, Pg. 397, Edited: Sayyid Ali Jamal Ashraf Husaini, Daarul Uswa Lit Tabaa-a war Nashar, 1st edition, 1416 A.H.

[12] *Yanabiul Mawaddah Li Zawil Qurba*, Vol. 2, Pg. 272, Edited Sayyid Ali Jamal Ashraf Husaini, Daarul Uswa Lit Tabaa-a wa Nashar, 1st edition, 1416 A.H.

[13] *Manaqib Ali Ibne Abi Talib wa Maa Nazala minal Quran fee Ali (a)*, Pg. 76-77, No. 57, Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Musa Ibne Marduya Isfahani (d. 410 A.H.), Edited: Abdur Razzaq Muhammad Husain Hirzuddin, Daarul Hadith, 2nd edition 1424 A.H.

[14] *Manaqib Ali Ibne Abi Talib wa Maa Nazala minal Quran fee Ali (a)*, Pg. 76-77, No. 58, Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Musa Ibne Marduya Isfahani (d. 410 A.H.), Edited: Abdur Razzaq Muhammad Husain Hirzuddin, Daarul Hadith, 2nd edition 1424 A.H.

[15] Refer to Part One of this book under reference no. 9 under the objection of Wahabis to the report of Tibrani.

[16] *Al-Jamiul Ahkaamul Quran*, Vol. 1, Pg. 91, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Ahmad Ansari Qurtubi (d. 671 A.H.), Daarul Shaab, Cairo;

Tarikh Baghdad, Vol. 3, Pg. 290, Ahmad bin Ali Abu Bakr al-Khatib Baghdadi (d. 463 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut;

Tarikh Medina Damishq wa Zikr Fadhlaha wa Tasmiya man Halha minal Amail, Vol. 42, Pg. 290, Abul Qasim Ali bin Hasan Ibne Hibtullah bin Abdullah Shafei (d. 571 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1995, Edited: Mohibbuddin Abi Saeed Umar bin Ghurama Umari.

[17] *Murujuz Zahab*, Vol. 1, Pg. 347, Abul Hasan Ali bin Husain bin Ali Masudi (d. 346 A.H.)

[18] Tajuddin Subki has mentioned the name of Masudi among Shafei scholars and he considers him to be a historian, Islamic jurist (*Mufti*) and most learned (*Allamah*):

Ali bin Husain Masudi is the author historical books like *Murujuz Zahab* and *Zakhairul Uloom*...and other books. It is said that he was a descendant of Abdullah bin Masud. He was originally from Baghdad and he lived there for sometime, but later, mostly he lived in Egypt. He had natural disposition for making reports, he was issuing verdicts and was an intelligent person.

Tabqatush Shafia Kubra, Vol. 3, Pg. 456, Tajuddin bin Ali bin Abdul Kafi Subaki (d. 771 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mahmud Muhammad Tanahi, Dr. Abdul Fattah Muhammad Halu, Hajar Lit Taba-a wan Nashar wa Tauzih – 1413 A.H., 2nd edition.

Alimi Hanbali writes about Masudi as follows:

Ali bin Husain bin Ali Abul Hasan Masudi was among the great historical figures and was most famous of those who made journeys for collecting traditions...he authored a number of books, like *Murujuz Zahab, Akhbaruz Zaman* and other valuable books.

Al-Unsul Jaleel Ba Tarikhul Quds wal Khaleel, Vol. 1, Pg. 11, Mujiruddin Hanbali Alimi (d. 927 A.H.), Edited: Adnan Yunus Abdul Majid Nubatah, Maktabe Dandis, Amman, 1420 A.H. – 1999 A.D.

Akri Hanbali has also stated as follows:

In that year (345 A.H.) passed away Masudi, historian and author of *Murujuz Zahab*. He was Abul Hasan Ali bin Abul Hasan. He traveled to a number of places. His research in history is singular. He has written books on principles of religion and other sciences.

Shazaratuz Zahab fee Akhbar min Zahab, Vol. 2, Pg. 371, Abdul Hayy bin Ahmad bin Muhammad Akri Hanbali (d. 1089 A.H.), Edited: Abdul Qadir *Arnut*, Mahmud Arnaut, Daar Ibne Kathir, Damascus, 1st edition, 1406 A.H.

OBJECTION 18:
IF THE CLAIM OF SHIA HAD BEEN VALID, ALI (A) WOULD NOT HAVE COOPERATED WITH THE CALIPHS

EXPLANATION

One of the objections of the Wahabis regarding the subject of Fatima is as follows:

If His Eminence, Ali (a) has bad intention about Umar or was really displeased with him, and considered him an usurper of his rights, he would have always waited for an opportunity for securing his rights and would have taken advantage of this golden opportunity against the usurper of his rights.

When Umar took counsel from Sayyidna Ali (a), regarding his personal appearance in the battle against Persians the latter advised him not go there personally. Whereas it was possible for him not to advise thus so that he would have gone and got killed and the ground would have become clear for his Caliphate; however we see what extraordinary sincerity Ali (a) displayed in being a well wisher of Umar and all Muslims.[1]

LOGICAL REPLY

A. Types of counsel and sincere advices of Amirul Momineen (a)

All the counsel of Amirul Momineen (a) to the Caliphs can be divided into three groups:

1- Counsel in jurisprudential matters

2- Counsel in defense and military matters

3- Counsel in academic matters and solving difficulties about fundamentals of faith.

The role of Amirul Momineen (a) in these instances was mostly in the style of a reply to a request for guidance and directions for the opposite party; such that even if they had not been Muslims, it was his duty to advise them with all honesty; especially if the matter concerned defense of religion, Shariah and foundations of Islam.

Sayyid Murtaza (r) says in this regard:

> Your statement is based on help and cooperation of Amirul Momineen (a) with Abu Bakr regarding war against the people of Ridda; it is nothing but just a claim and there is no proof to support it. If the aim had been to give counsel in religious law, as this matter is obligatory on all scholars of religion and it cannot prove cooperation with Caliphs and if the aim of the counsel of Amirul Momineen (a) was to protect life, property and honor of the people of Medina it is also a matter, which is obligatory, because in addition of defending the honor of people, he had also defended his own life. Thus, this matter is not having any relation to supporting of their Caliphate.[2]

B. Defending the religion was the most important duty of Amirul Momineen (a)

The most important of the duties and functions of Imam, leader and the divinely chosen one is defending the Shariat.

However, this responsibility is different according to the circumstances of different periods, and it is necessary to have the proper response depending on the situation. Sometimes it should be by observing patience and forbearance in calamities and usurpation of rights; sometimes also to come face to face and through direct intervention taking a definite stance.

Ibne Hajar Haithami has quoted from the Messenger of Allah (s) that he said:

> In every age just persons from my Ahle Bayt would be present in my Ummah, who would keep away the distortions of the deviated ones, inappropriate and invalid attribution and interpretations of the ignorant from religion.[3]

If Amirul Momineen (a) was kept away from the position of caliph and successorship of the Messenger of Allah (s) and his right was denied to him, but it does mean that he should be heedless of his other duties; because sometimes wrong planning and decisions put the foundations of Islam into danger; in these instances the Imam is duty bound that he should not permit Islamic law to be sacrificed at the altar of ignorance. Among its examples is the incident of battle of Muslim army in Nahawand, Iran, which would be discussed soon.

In such circumstances, Amirul Momineen (a), like every honorable Muslim person, is duty bound to guard the new faith and to defend the Islamic system.

C. It was the duty of Amirul Momineen (a) to defend the oppressed

Interventions of Amirul Momineen (a) in matters of jurisprudence is evidence of ignorance of the caliphs regarding the simplest laws of Islam and the rights of the helpless and the oppressed, which they trespassed. In fact, Amirul Momineen (a) was the sole refuge of the rights of people; that if His Eminence had not defended their rights, it was certain that there was no way of restoration of their rights.

His Eminence, in the 'Shiqshiqya Sermon' has mentioned among the arguments of acceptance of Caliphate after the killing of Uthman that the Almighty Allah has taken oath from the scholars to remove injustice from the helpless:

> Behold, by Him who split the grain (to grow) and created living beings, if people had not come to me and

> supporters had not exhausted the argument and if there had been no pledge of Allah with the learned to the effect that they should not acquiesce in the gluttony of the oppressor and the hunger of the oppressed, I would have cast the rope of Caliphate on its own shoulders, and would have given the last one the same treatment as to the first one. Then you would have seen that in my view this world of yours is no better than the sneezing of a goat.[4]

For further clarification, we quote another example of intervention of the Imam in jurisprudential matters, which is mentioned in *Sihah Sitta*:

> Ibne Abbas says: A mentally unstable woman was brought to Umar; she was accused of fornication. He discussed this matter with some people then issued an order that she be stoned to death. When they were taking her to be punished, Imam Ali (a) passed from there. His Eminence asked: What has she done? They said: She is a mentally unstable woman from so and so tribe, who has committed fornication and Umar has sentenced her to be stoned to death. Imam Ali (a) said: Release her. Then he came to Umar and said: Do you not know that three persons are exempted (from punishment): 1- The insane till his sanity is restored. 2- The sleeping person till he awakes. 3- A child, till he attains maturity. Yes, I have heard it. His Eminence said: Then release this female. Umar said: 'God is the greatest', and freed her.[5]

It is interesting that Bukhari has also narrated this report, but as always, in order to save the honor of caliphs has omitted the central matter and conclusion and has only hinted to a part of it:

> Ali (a) said to Umar: Do you not know that three persons are exempted: 1- The insane till his sanity is restored. 2- The sleeping person till he awakes. 3- A child, till he attains maturity?[6]

In the same way, Ibne Abde Barr has written with correct chains of narrators:

> Umar often sought the refuge of God from a situation when Ali (a) was not present to solve his problems. One such instance was when a mentally unstable woman delivered a child in six months and Umar wanted to stone her to death. Ali (a) said to Umar: According to the Almighty Allah the period of pregnancy and weaning is thirty months. And he also told him: Allah, the Mighty and Sublime has exempted the insane from religious duties. It was in that instance that Umar said: If Ali (a) had not been there, Umar would have perished.[7]

Such type of instances prove that the presence of Amirul Momineen (a) had a very effective role in revival of Divine laws and on the other side he was a firm support for restoring the rights of the oppressed and warding off oppression from the oppressed.

According to the narration of Samani, an incident similar to this occurred during the reign of Uthman; that if Amirul Momineen (a) had not intervened, a pregnant believer lady would have been sacrificed, because of the ignorance of the Caliph about Islamic laws.[8]

D. Administrative counsels from the aspect of defense are from the basic principles of Islam

Administrative counsels of Amirul Momineen (a) were restricted to instances that political and administrative crisis – due to the wrong plannings of rulers – pose danger to the

foundation and bases of Islamic society, on the basis of this, it should not be that such guidance and cooperation should be construed as defense of Caliphs and declaration of his approval about them.

In order to further explain this point, we mention some examples of such crises in which Amirul Momineen (a), through his miraculous planning, saved Islam from fatal dangers:

The Battle of Nahawand was the most dangerous battle of the early period of Islam, because the defeated army of the Persians, in order to revenge their defeats in the past battles had raised a large army throughout Iran consisting of 150000 men, so that this time, not only they may defeat the Muslim army in Kufa; but also annex all Islamic territories and destroy Islam.

Ibne Athir Jazari has stated regarding the strength of the Iranian army in this battle:

> The event and the Battle of Nahawand occurred after the defeat of Persians. It was a 150000 strong army under the command of Firoz and it marched upto Nahawand.[9]

For further explanation of the sensitive nature of this battle, we must mention the role of the letter of Ammar Yasir in defeat or victory of the Muslims for the fate of Muslims, which is quoted in the book of *Futuh* of Ibne Asim:

Ammar Yasir, in his letter to Umar bin Khattab, wrote as follows:

> ...know that all our friends and companions have been killed in their towns and they have come near the lands, which we had liberated and they want to annex one town after another till Kufa. By God, we are terrified of the reports that reach us. I am writing this letter to you so that you may take a decision and instruct us accordingly.

When the letter reached Umar, he read it and when he came to know about its contents, he started trembling. In such a way that due to the severity of fear and anxiety, the chattering of his teeth was audible to Muslims. Umar came to the Masjid and called out: O Emigrants (*Muhajireen*) and Helpers (*Ansar*), where are you? Come here! May Allah have mercy on you. Help us! May Allah help you.

After the people gathered in the Masjid, Umar said: O people, today is a day of grief and sorrow. See what news has arrived from Iraq. People asked: What happened? He replied: People of Iran were previously divided and dispersed, but by the support of Satan they have come together and killed our friends in different places. This is the letter of Ammar Yasir from Kufa. It says that 150000 have gathered in Nahawand and some of them have marched upto Madayan and Kufa till the towns of Halwan, Khanqin, Jalula. They intend to capture Madayan and Kufa. If they reach upto these two places it would be an un-mendable blow on Islam. I beseech you in the name of Allah to tell me about your view in this regard.

Companions of the Caliph: like Talha bin Ubaidullah, Zubair bin Awwam, Abdur Rahman bin Auf only expressed their sympathy, but did offer any suggestion. After hearing the statements of all the people his trembling increased.

Advices and suggestions of companions did not satisfy Umar and he was compelled to take "refuge of the Ummah" and "solver of the difficulties of the time", Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) and he said: O Abul Hasan, why do not offer your suggestion like others?

Amirul Momineen (a) removed the seal from his lips and said as follows by way of good advice and well wishing for the honor and salvation of the Ummah:

> ...you stay put in Medina, as it would be more effective against the enemies and more terrifying to them,

> because if you personally go the Battle of Persians, they would say: The leader of Arabs is left alone and is having fewer men and then they will fight with more fervor. Thus, send the warriors and yourself stay here.[10]

If Amirul Momineen (a) in such circumstances had not intervened and guided them in such important matters, what the fate of Islam and Muslims would have been?

Can it be claimed that Amirul Momineen (a) defended the person of Umar? Can such advice and guidance prove his approval and support to the Caliph's regime?

E. Statistics of the Caliphs taking counsel of Amirul Momineen (a)

With attention to the numerous instances of asking about the view, advice and intellectual assistance of Amirul Momineen (a) on one side it shows helplessness of the Caliphs in solving the difficulties and their needfulness for intelligence and experience of Amirul Momineen (a); and on the other hand it was restricted to instances of referring and seeking advices and it shows that there was very less interaction between them and Imam Ali (a) was very much aloof from administrative issues.

1. Statistics of taking counsels during the period of Abu Bakr

Contemporary scholar, Shaykh Najmuddin Askari, in the book, *Ali wal Khulafa*, has written:

> Abu Bakr, during 2 years and 3 months (27 months) of his Caliphate referred to Imam Ali (a) 14 times.[11]

From the sum total of 14 instances, 9 were academic questions; 4 were about Islamic laws and jurisprudence and 1 was concerned with administration.

The point to be noted is that from 14 instances, only in four instances (three academic instances and one academic instance) Abu Bakr referred to Imam Ali (a) directly. From the remaining 9 instances, in two cases, Imam Ali (a) expressed his opinion after counsel was taken from other companions. In two instances, he expressed his view because he was present on the stage of action; in three instances Imam Ali (a) took the steps when he got information about it. In two instances there was a person who served as a medium between the Imam and Caliph.

In such circumstances, is it correct to say that during his Caliphate, Abu Bakr took the counsel of Ali (a) in all important affairs and he did nothing without taking advice?

2. Statistics of taking counsels during the period of Umar bin Khattab

During a period of 10 years and 5 months (125 months in all in the Caliphate of Umar bin Khattab there were 85 instances when Imam Ali (a) was referred.[12]

From the sum total of 85 instances, the seeking of counsel by Umar from Imam Ali (a) in 59 instances was concerned with jurisprudential matters; 21 instances concerned academic inquiries; 3 instances about monetary issues, 2 instances about administrative matters.

It is noteworthy that Umar bin Khattab from the sum total of 85 instances: in 27 instances Umar bin Khattab sought direct and initial advice of the Imam; from which 13 instances were concerned with Islamic law and jurisprudence. 2 instances were about financial matter and one was academic inquiry. The Caliph initially referred to the companions and then asked about the view of the Imam.

In the remaining instances also, since the Imam was present on the scene he expressed his opinion. That is in 42 instances

even though access to the Imam was possible, but his presence was ignored.

With attention to the points mentioned above, is it right to falsely claim that Umar bin Khattab always sought counsel of Amirul Momineen (a) in difficulties and problems?

3. Statistics of taking counsels during the period of Uthman

Uthman, during a period of twelve years (144 months) of his rule, referred to Imam Ali (a) only on 8 occasions.[13]

From the sum total of 8 instances, in which Imam Ali (a) intervened in the affairs during the period of Uthman:

Firstly: All these matters concerned with the explanation of matters of religious law and about the application of legal penalties and jurisprudence;

Secondly: Three instances were such that the Caliph directly referred to the Imam and in four cases the Imam was present on the scene of action and he expressed his view.

POLEMICAL REPLY: WHY AMIRUL MOMINEEN (A) DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE CONQUESTS?

Amirul Momineen (a) due to his valor and excessive loyalty in the battles during the period of the Prophet and great expertise in military issues had left behind remarkable feats as reminders. The determinant role of Amirul Momineen (a) in the battles of the period of the Prophet of Islam (s), like the battles of Badr, Uhad, Khandaq, Khyber etc...from His Eminence, his fighting consisted of all undisputed finesse; as he himself says:

> "Is any one of them fiercer in war and older in it than I am? I rose for it, although yet within twenties..."[14]

The second Caliph, Umar bin Khattab, admitted:

> If the sword of Ali (a) had not been there, the pillars of Islam would not have been established.[15]

With attention to these specialties, the Caliphs could not remain indifferent to the aloofness of Amirul Momineen (a) from the battles, because his non-participation and aloofness can prompt the following question in the minds of Muslims that why Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a), with such a glorious role in the past battles, was now so indifferent and aloof, when it was a time of spread of Islam in lands of infidelity and polytheism? Now, what a change has appeared that Amirul Momineen (a) does not participate in any of the battles? Did he consider Jihad against polytheists as obligatory? Or did he consider the caliphate of the caliphs illegal and considered these battles innovations? Or that he considered inappropriate that Islam should be spread at the point of the sword? And did not want the future generations to regard Islam, a religion of kindness and mercy, as a religion of hatred and taxes against religion and intellect and that the rulers should be considered Islamic?

NOTES

[1] *Khilafat wa Intakhab*, Abdur Rahman Salimi, under reply no. 4 and 15 in the discussion of the incident of Ghadeer Khum.

[2] *Ash-Shafi fil Imamah*, Ali bin Husain Musawi, alias Sharif Murtaza (d. 436 A.D.), Vol. 3, Pg. 251, Mausisa Ismailiyan, Qom, 2nd edition, 1410.

[3] *Sawaiqul Mohriqa Alaa Ahle Rafdh, wa Zalaal wa Zandiqa*, Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ali Ibne Hajar Haithami (d. 973 A.H.), Vol. 2, Pg. 441, Mausasitur Risala – Lebanon – 1417 A.H. – 1997 A.D. 1st edition, Abdur Rahman bin Abdullah Turki – Kamil Muhammad Kharat.

[4] *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermons of Imam Ali (a), Sermon 2, Pg. 36

[5] *Sunan Abi Dawood, Vol. 4*, Page. 140, Tr. 4399, Kitabul Hudud, Baab fil Majnun Yasriqu aw Yusibu Haddan, Sulaiman bin Ashath Abu Dawood Sajistani Azdi (d. 275 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Edited: Muhammad Mohiuddin Abdul Hamid.

[6] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 6, Pg. 2499, Baab Laa Yurjamul Majnun wal Majnuna, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[7] *Al-Istiab fee Marifatul Ashab*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1103, Yusuf bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abde Barr (d. 463 A.H.), Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1412, First edition, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi.

[8] A woman delivered a child after six months of pregnancy. Her husband came to Uthman and explained the matter to him. Uthman decided to award the legal penalty to her. Ali (a) said: You don't have the right to punish her, because the Almighty Allah says: The period of pregnancy and weaning is thirty months. He also said: The mother should breast-feed male children for two complete years. Since the period of weaning is two years; if it is deducted six months remain for pregnancy. Hence Uthman released that woman.

Tafsirul Quran, Vol. 1, Pg. 236, Abul Muzaffar Mansur bin Muhammad bin Abdul Jabbar Samani (d. 489 A.H.), Darul Watan, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 1418 A.H. – 1997 A.D., First edition, Edited: Yasir bin Ibrahim and Ghanim bin Abbas bin Ghanim.

[9] *Al-Kamil fit Tarikh*, Vol. 2, Pg. 412, Abul Hasan Ali bin Abil Karam Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Abdul Karim Shaibani (d.

630 A.H.). Edited: Abdullah Qadi. Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut, Second edition, 1415 A.H.

[10] From the complete text of the letter, which is spread to five pages, we have just picked the key sentences and presented them and refrained from details for sake of brevity.

Kitabul Futuh, Allamah Abu Muhammad Ahmad bin Asim Kufi (d. 314 A.H.), Vol. 2, Pg. 290-295, Edited: Ali Sheri (authority on Islamic history), Darul Azwa Lit Taba-a wan Nashar wat Tauzi, First edition, 1411 A.H.

[11] *Ali wal Khulafa*, Shaykh Najmuddin Askari, Pg. 73-97

[12] *Ali wal Khulafa*, Shaykh Najmuddin Askari, Pg. 97-333

[13] *Ali wal Khulafa*, Shaykh Najmuddin Askari, Pg. 335-345

[14] *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermon 27, Vol. 1, Pg. 70

[15] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Ibne Abil Hadid, Vol. 12, Pg. 82

OBJECTION 19:
HOW IS IT POSSIBLE FOR ALI (A) TO GIVE THE HAND OF HIS DAUGHTER TO THE KILLER OF HIS WIFE?

EXPLANATION

One of the objections that Wahabis have spread widely, especially in recent years, is the issue of marriage of the second caliph with Umme Kulthum with the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) and Lady Fatima Zahra (s).

In this claim, the Wahabis say:

Shia claim that the second caliph was the killer of Lady Fatima Zahra (s); but what reasoning can accept that His Eminence, Ali (r) should give his daughter in marriage to the killer of his wife and established family relations with him?

LOGICAL REPLY

Different replies from different angles

Shia scholars have given reasonable and correct replies to this objection from different angles and points of view, some of which, we will mention as follows:[1]

1- Some scholars like: Raziuddin Hilli (r), Allamah Muqarram (r), Allamah Baqir Sharif Qarashi etc...have denied existence of a daughter of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) named Umme Kulthum and have provided satisfactory proofs to support this contention.

2- Some scholars like Shaykh Mufeed (r), Sayyid Nasir Husain Hindi (r) and Ayatullah Milani consider the occurrence of dispute in traditional reports of marriage to be clear proofs for refutation of the claim of Ahle Sunnat regarding this marriage.

3- Other scholars like: Sayyid Murtaza (r) has accepted this marriage under duress and threats of Umar and exigencies, which Amirul Momineen (a) was facing.

Although we consider the cause mentioned below to be the strongest cause and have based our reply on it, but we have also explained the testimonies for other suppositions as well.

4- We and a group of Shia and Sunni scholars by accepting the origin of this marriage are having the following view:

Yes, Umar bin Khattab did marry a female named Umme Kulthum, but not that Umme Kulthum, who is mentioned in the objection of the opponents of Shia, on the contrary, this marriage was performed with Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr and who lived in the house of Amirul Momineen (a) for a part of her life.

Among those having this belief is Yahya bin Sharaf Nawawi, the most prominent commentator of *Sahih Muslim* in the book of *Tahdhibul Asma* he has mentioned this point and among Shia scholars, Ayatullah Marashi Najafi. Being an expert of genealogy, the family tree of the Ahle Bayt clan was in his possession he has sated this in the book of *Sharh Ahqaqul Haqq*, which shall be explained soon.

We consider the last probability to be stronger than others, because:

Firstly: In none of the traditional reports present in Shia books is it mentioned clearly that this Umme Kulthum was the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) from Lady Fatima Zahra (s); on the contrary, at the most which is mentioned is the issue of a daughter named Umme Kulthum who lived for only a part of her life in the house of Amirul Momineen (a), who according to our belief, is Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr.

Secondly: All traditional reports of Ahle Sunnat books, which try to prove this marriage, carry doubts in the chains of their narrators and are also having contradictions; hence it is impossible to rely on them.

So much so that if all suppositions mentioned above are overlooked and we only accept the claim of Wahabis, even then we cannot say that it is a definite proof of existence of cordial relations between Amirul Momineen (a) and the Caliphs; on the contrary, in that supposition that which is proved at the most is a blemish on the usurpers of Caliphate; because in this report, which is used by Wahabis to support their claim, such points are mentioned, which would shame every modest human being, as we shall hint in the coming discussions.

A. There is no daughter of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) named Umme Kulthum

Some Shia intellectuals and scholars believe that Umme Kulthum was the agnomen (*Kunniyat*) of Zainab (a) and basically Amirul Momineen (a) did not have any daughter of this agnomen (*Kunniyat*) from Lady Fatima Zahra (s), except Zainab (a) and the children of Imam (a) from Lady Fatima Zahra (s) were not more than four; Imam Hasan, Imam Husain, His Eminence, Mohsin and Her Eminence, Zainab (a).

But those who have added another child having agnomen (*Kunniyat*) of Umme Kulthum, have in their view, reports in which, sometimes, the name of Zainab is mentioned and sometimes the agnomen (*Kunniyat*) of Umme Kulthum is stated; due to this they have mentioned both the names, ignorant of the fact that Umme Kulthum is the agnomen (*Kunniyat*) of Zainab Kubra; as this point is mentioned in numerous books of Shia genealogy.

Testimonies of Shia scholar in support of this view:

Raziuddin Hilli, one of the great Shia scholars of the 8th century A.H. has mentioned as follows, regarding the children of Amirul Momineen (a):

> The total number of children of Ali (a) – both male and female – is 27. Hasan, Husain, Zainab Kubra whose agnomen (*Kunniyat*) is Umme Kulthum were all children of the respected daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s).[2]

The Late Ayatullah Marashi (r) has also, in *Sharh Ahqaqul Haqq* quoted from Fadhl bin Ruzbahan, a scholar of 10th century A.H. thus:

> His Eminence, Amirul Momineen (a) had 17 children according to one report and twenty according to another report.

But his children from Her Eminence, Fatima (s) were: Imam Hasan (a), Imam Husain (a), His Eminence, Mohsin who attainted martyrdom in infancy – another is Umme Kulthum. These were his four children from Lady Fatima (s).[3]

In the above text we see that Umme Kulthum is considered to be same as Her Eminence Zainab (a).

Baqir Sharif Qarashi, a contemporary research scholar, and among the most prominent Shia scholar residing in Najaf, says in this regard:

> Siddiqa Tahira did not have any daughter other than Her Eminence Zainab and only her agnomen (*Kunniyat*) was Umme Kulthum as some researchers opine. In any case, I am without any doubt, of the opinion that Siddiqa Tahira did not have any daughter named Umme Kulthum.[4]

Testimonies of Ahle Sunnat scholars in support of this view:

Some Ahle Sunnat intellectuals have also mentioned only four or three children of Lady Zahra (s) and have not mentioned the name of Umme Kulthum among them.

Salihi Shami has written in *Sobolul Huda war Rishaad*:

> Among the children of Ali (a) from Lady Fatima Zahra (s) were: Hasan, Husain, Mohsin and Zainab Kubra (a); and he had many children from other wives as well.[5]

Shahabuddin Qalyubi (d. 1069 A.H.) in the marginal notes of commentary of Jalaluddin Mahalli on *Minhajut Talibiyyin* has mentioned the number of children of Amirul Momineen (a) to be three and has quoted the same view from Jalaluddin Suyuti.

Jalaluddin Suyuti has said: The Messenger of Allah (s) did not have any child other than Fatima (s) and Fatima (s) after her marriage to Ali (a), gave birth to children named: Hasan, Husain and Zainab (a). Zainab (s) was married to the son of her uncle, Abdullah and from him had children named: Ali, Aun Akbar, Abbas, Muhammad and Umme Kulthum.[6]

Shaykh Muhammad Khizri, an Egyptian Ahle Sunnat scholar also believes that Lady Fatima Zahra (s) had only three children:

> In the second year after migration (*Hijrat*), Ali (a), aged 21 years, married Fatima (s), who fifteen years old and the sons of the Messenger of Allah (s): Hasan, Husain; and Zainab (s) were the fruits of this marriage.[7]

We have a large number of testimonies in support of this view, but for the sake of brevity, we have refrained from stating them all; and think that only this much is sufficient:

There is no authentic and true traditional report from Shia sources that enumerates Umme Kulthum among the names of the children of Lady Zahra (s). The name of Umme Kulthum and Zainab is mentioned in only one instance; mostly they have mentioned either Zainab or Umme Kulthum.

Also in no authentic and true traditional report of Shia is this matter mentioned in unequivocal words that the second Caliph married the daughter of Lady Fatima Zahra (s). On the contrary, in all traditional reports it has introduced Umme Kulthum to be a daughter in the house of Imam Ali (a) and that through which reasoning is done, are personal opinions and statements of some scholars and these also cannot be decisive proof for others.

B. Umme Kulthum was the daughter of Abu Bakr or Amirul Momineen (a)?

As opposed to the claims of the opponents, they have introduced this daughter to be a child of Amirul Momineen (a) from Lady Zahra (s), in no reports of Shia is it hinted that this daughter was the issue of Amirul Momineen (a) from Lady Fatima (s); on the contrary, a daughter named Umme Kulthum is mentioned who lived in the house of Amirul Momineen (a) and she came into marriage to Umar (and that also forcibly) and Amirul Momineen (a) after the killing of Umar, took her back into his house.

At the most we can say: It is possible that she was a daughter of Amirul Momineen (a), but not from Lady Fatima Zahra (s); on the contrary, she was from some other wife. As a result of this all the furor and din created by Wahabis is of no avail.

But the probability, which is stronger than all other known possibilities and reports of Shia and Sunni, which according to the admission of some senior scholars of Ahle Sunnat is that Umme Kulthum was the true daughter of Abu Bakr and a step

daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) and that is why she lived in the house of the Imam.

C. Most important confession of commentator of Sahih Muslim on Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr

Some Ahle Sunnat scholars have confessed to the fact that Umme Kulthum, who was married to Umar, was the daughter of Abu Bakr and not Amirul Momineen (a).

Among the supporters of this view is Mohiuddin Nawawi, the most important commentator of *Sahih Muslim*, who in his book of *Tahdhibul Asma* has expressed this view and has defended it:

> Two sisters of Ayesha are mentioned...it was previously mentioned in *Asmaur Rijal* in the fourth chapter that these two sisters, Asma, daughter of Abu Bakr and Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr and she was the same Umme Kulthum, whom Umar married.[8]

With attention to this admission, numerous facts come to light and it is proved that the marriage of the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) to Umar is nothing more than fiction.

Marriage based on this supposition is also in agreement with historical circumstances; because the first and second Caliphs were old friends and partners of each other. On death of Abu Bakr, it is natural that the second Caliph should feel responsible towards him and to take his family under his guardianship; and marrying his daughter was the best way to fulfill this duty.

D. The view of the commentator of Sahih Muslim is supported by Shia experts of genealogy

Shia experts of genealogy have also accepted Nawawi's statement and do not consider Umme Kulthum, wife of Umar, to be an issue of Amirul Momineen (a).

Ayatullah Marashi Najafi (r), as all the present family trees of the clan of Ahle Bayt (a) are in his possession, has hinted to this same point in the margins of *Sharh Ahqaqul Haqq* and he considers it to be the view of researchers:

> [Asma, wife of Ja'far Tayyar] migrated to Abyssinia along with her husband and later returned to Medina. After Ja'far, Abu Bakr married her and had a number of children from her, among whom was Umme Kulthum, with whom the second Caliph married and Amirul Momineen (a) adopted her into his house as a daughter and brought her up along with his own daughters. The Imam referred to Muhammad (Ibne Abu Bakr) as his own son and called Umme Kulthum as his own daughter and that is why some traditionists and historians due to commonality of noun or adjective have fallen into doubts. After the death of Abu Bakr, Amirul Momineen (a) married Asma.[9]

As opposed to this view, only one objection exists and it is that some have claimed that this daughter could not be the one brought up by Amirul Momineen (a), because according to Ahle Sunnat reports, the mother of Umme Kulthum was Habiba binte Kharija and she, after the death of Abu Bakr, married Khabib bin Asaaf and not Amirul Momineen (a).

In reply we say: Marriage of the mother of Umme Kulthum with this person is also among the fabricated lies of this incident, so that all venues for exposition of facts may be closed. The falsehood of this incident comes to light when it becomes clear the ancient historical sources of Ahle Sunnat say that Khabib bin Asaaf was killed in the Battle of Yamama, which took place during the period of Abu Bakr.

Muhammad bin Habib Baghdadi has written in *Mahbar*:

> Khabib bin Asaaf was killed in the Battle of Yamama (against Musailima Kazzab).[10]

E. Contradictions present in the narration of this incident

One of the proofs that this incident is fictional is presence of severe contradictions in this issue to such an extent that it removed every kind belief in its veracity.

Since these contradictions are wide ranging and it is not possible to mention all of them in this book, we only present some of them by way of examples. And those who are interested in details can refer to the sources mentioned in the footnote at the beginning of reply to this objection:

1. Whom did Umme Kulthum marry after Umar's death? Because according to Wahabis, Umme Kulthum remained alive after Umar was killed. In order to prove that she was the same Umme Kulthum, they have invented many husbands for her.

2. Age of Umme Kulthum at the time of her marriage: (There is severe difference of opinion among Shia scholars regarding the age of Umme Kulthum at the time of her marriage to Umar. Since the reputation of the Caliph is at stake, they have shown her to be so young that kissing, taking her in the lap and even exposing her thing is not unlawful. That is why they have accepted the following statements: A. She had not reached the age of maturity enough to stimulate a male. B. She was a young and immature girl, who played with other girls of her age. C. She was ten years old or a little more than that...)

3. Quantum of the dower of Umme Kulthum: (There is remarkable difference as to the amount of Umme Kulthum's dower. Some say that it was 10000 dinars, some say it was 40000 dinars and some say it was 40000 dirhams.)

4. Did Umar have any children from Umme Kulthum? (Some have not mentioned any children of Umme Kulthum. Some say that she had only a son named Zaid. Some have added Ruqaiyyah and some say that she had three children named: Zaid, Ruqaiyyah and Fatima.)

5. Whether Zaid was the brother of Umar or his son?

6. Zaid Junior was elder to Zaid Senior.

7. Date of the demise of Umme Kulthum and Zaid: (There are many differences regarding the date of death of Umme Kulthum and Zaid as well. Some say that both died during the period of Imam Hasan (a); others say that both were poisoned at the hands of Abdul Malik bin Marwan.

8. Nature of the death of Umme Kulthum and Zaid.

9. Did Zaid have any children? (Different views are mentioned regarding the fact whether Zaid bin Umar had children or not. Some claim that he had children and some have said with certainty that he had no children.)

10. Age of Zaid at the time of his death: (How old was Zaid bin Umar when he died? Some say that he was a child, some are of the view that he was a youth and some say that he was aged.)

11. Who recited the funeral prayer of Umme Kulthum and Zaid? (Different reports are narrated regarding who recited the funeral prayers of Zaid and his mother. Some say it was Abdullah Ibne Umar and some opine it was Saeed bin Aas.).

12. Presence of Abu Qatada Badri in the congregational funeral prayer. (One of its contradictions is the presence of Abu Qatada Badri as he had died many years before this event.)

13. Umar married Umme Kulthum or Zainab [Differences and contradictions in reports of Ahle Sunnat are to such an extent that they themselves don't know which daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) Umar married. Abdul Hayy Katani believes that Umar married Zainab (s).]

14. Who selected the Imam of congregation (*Jamat*)? (Inventors of this fiction, in order to embellish this story so

that it might be accepted, have claimed that Imam Hasan (a) and Imam Husain (a) were also present in the funeral, but the saying that funeral prayer was led by Abdullah bin Umar or Saeed bin Aas puts a question mark on this. When the sons of the Messenger of Allah (s) were present there; they (Hasan and Husain) were brothers of Umme Kulthum and more worthy of praying her funeral prayer; so this statement invalidates their own claim. Another question that arises is which of the two brothers prayed? Regarding this also there are different views. Some say that it was Hasan bin Ali (a) and some say that it was Husain bin Ali (a).

F. Impertinence to the ladies of the Messenger of Allah (s) and Amirul Momineen (a)

Inventors of this fiction have tried every means to prove the marriage of Umar with Umme Kulthum and fabricated such reports, which would put to shame every modest person who hears this story.

We ask them: At what cost is the proving of good relations? To such an extent that they consider it lawful to make indecent and repulsive attribution to the Messenger of Allah (s) and Amirul Momineen (a) and also cause insult to the second caliph of Ahle Sunnat.

Evidences of the fiction of marriage of Umme Kulthum with Umar have charges and least of them is forcible possession of the ladies from the house of the Messenger of Allah (s). Are the fabricators of this fiction ready to accept the charges of this fiction?

We shall explain this topic in different headings:

1. He exposed the thigh of Umme Kulthum and glanced at it

Ibne Hajar Asqalani, a prominent and influential Ahle Sunnat scholar, in his two books of *Talkhisul Habir* and *Isabah* and many other great Ahle Sunnat scholars have narrated the

following insulting sentences, which only go on to prove their filthy mentality and is alone sufficient, without requiring any explanation, so we have just quoted them verbatim for the readers, who may themselves form a judgment about it.

It is narrated from Muhammad bin Ali that Umar sought the hand of Umme Kulthum in marriage from Ali (a). Ali (a) mentioned that she was of a young age, but in spite of that he said: I am sending you to her, if she pleases you, you may take her in marriage. Ali (a) sent Umme Kulthum to Umar. Umar exposed the thigh of Umme Kulthum. Umme Kulthum said in response to this step: If you had not been the caliph, I would have blinded you.[11]

2. He touched the exposed leg of Umme Kulthum

Dhahabi, a prominent Ahle Sunnat scholar, in his book of *Seer Aalamun Nubla* and many other senior Ahle Sunnat scholars have described this insult in the worst manner:

Umar said to Ali (a): Give the hand of Umme Kulthum to me in marriage. Through this marriage, I wish to get such nobility, which no one has achieved. Ali (a) said: Even though Umme Kulthum due to her young age makes excuses; but in spite of that I will send her to you. If you are able to get her approval, I will marry her to you. Ali (a) sent Umme Kulthum to Umar with a piece of cloth and told her: Say to Umar on my behalf: This is a piece of cloth about which I told you. Umme Kulthum conveyed the message of Imam to Umar. Umar said: Tell your father: I am pleased, may Allah be pleased with you. Then Umar placed his hand at the thigh of Umme Kulthum and exposed it. Umme Kulthum said: How can you do this? If you had not been caliph, I would have broken your nose. Then she came to her father and reported to him about the bad behavior of Umar and said: Why did you send me to an evil-doer old man?[12]

3. He kissed Umme Kulthum!

Khatib Baghdadi, another great Ahle Sunnat scholar has added many other obscene and repulsive details to the above text in his book of *Tarikh Baghdad:*

> Ali (a) decorated his daughter and sent her to Umar. When Umar saw her, he came to her and caught her thigh and said: Tell your father that I agree, I agree, I agree. So Umme Kulthum returned to her father. Imam asked: What was the decision of Umar? Umme Kulthum said: When I arose, he called me, held my thigh, kissed me and said: Tell your father that I agree.[13]

4. Legalizing exposure of thigh by proving the fiction of marriage

Since the three caliphs considered themselves as successors of the Messenger of Allah (s), they considered themselves to have discretion of formulating laws of religion as well. The best proofs of this claim are their innumerable innovations and deviations, which are mentioned in Ahle Sunnat books.

Omitting of the phrase of 'Hasten to the best of deeds' (*Hayya Alaa Khairil Amal*) and addition of the words of 'The prayer is better than sleep' instead, and other wide ranging changes in prayer, Hajj, Zakat etc. are all reminders of 25 years of the rule of the three caliphs.

Through the propaganda that appeared, people also regarded the caliphs in the same way. So much so that they considered the practice of the caliphs to be at par with Quran and Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s) and considered following the caliphs obligatory.

This step of Umar of exposing the thigh hinted in the above report not only legalized exposing the thigh of slave girls before their becoming lawful in marriage; on the contrary, it legalized many more obscene acts.

According to Ahle Sunnat traditional reports, Abdullah bin Umar was of those who followed the practice of his father and considered as his right to expose the thighs of girls and slave maids before they become lawful by marriage.

Abdur Razzaq Sanani has written in *Musannaf*:

> It is narrated from Ibne Umar that whenever he wanted to acquire a slave girl and after the cost was decided, he used to put his hand on her thigh, exposed the thigh and her private parts and glance at it.[14]

Here it is noteworthy that since the author was capable to conceal the obscene and unlawful acts of Abdullah bin Umar, he has very conveniently interpreted the Arabic word of *Qubul,* which means 'private parts' into 'belly'. This is absolutely without any justification and anyone of an equitable disposition would understand that it was only blind prejudice, which has encouraged the author to present such interpretation.

Ibne Umar passed by some people selling slave girls; when they saw him they lifted their hands from the body of the slave girl. Ibne Umar came to them and exposed the thigh of that girl and then he tapped her chest and then said: Buy her. In the same way, it is narrated that Ibne Umar put his hand between the breasts of that girl and shook them.[15]

This act, which was attributed to the Caliph in Ahle Sunnat reports, after him this practice, was observed by their followers as a respectable act and they considered it lawful for themselves. Busr bin Artat, the famous evildoer of history is of those who committed this act many times with Muslim ladies upon the orders of Muawiyah.

When a claimant for successorship of the Messenger of Allah (s) did not have respect for a lady of His Eminence, he

exposed her thigh, took her in the lap and kissed her; what can be expected from his son, Abdullah and some others like Busr bin Artat? According to Saadi:

If a king trespasses on the property of his subjects

To what extent can his slaves go?

OBSCENITY OF THIS ACT IN THE OPINION OF EQUITABLE AHLE SUNNAT SCHOLARS

Obscenity of this act was to such an extent that even the voices of some equitable Ahle Sunnat scholars are heard against it and it is well known that since the soup was so hot that even the screams of the cook were heard.

Sibte Ibne Jauzi writes in this regard:

> My grandfather has narrated in the book of *Mutazim* that Ali (a) sent Umme Kulthum to Umar that he may see her, but Umar exposed her thigh and touched it. By Allah, such an act is obscene, even if she was a slave girl; Umar had no right to commit this act, because according to the consensus of Muslims, touching stranger ladies is unlawful.[16]

G. Did Amirul Momineen (a) act against the Sunnah of the Prophet?

It is certain that when Umar and Abu Bakr sought from him the hand of Lady Zahra (s) in marriage, the Messenger of Allah (s) slapped their chest and turned away from them. In fact, the Holy Prophet (s), by this act of his, made them understand that between them and Lady Zahra (s) there was no compatibility of any kind: in age, in religion, in faith, in morals, in lineage and birth...

Ibne Hajar Haithami, in the eleventh chapter of *Sawaiqul Mohriqa*, which he wrote in refutation of Shia, says:

Abu Dawood Sajistani has narrated that Abu Bakr sought the hand of Lady Zahra (s) in marriage. The Messenger of Allah (s) turned away from him. Then Umar sought. The Messenger of Allah (s) turned away from him as well...[17]

Ibne Hibban in his *Sahih* and Nasai in his *Sunan* write:

> Abu Bakr and Umar sought the hand of Fatima. The Messenger of Allah (s) said to them: Fatima is young in age. Then Ali (a) sought her hand in marriage. The Prophet accepted and gave her in marriage to Ali (a).[18]

With these expositions, is there possibility that Amirul Momineen (a) acted against the practice of the Messenger of Allah (s); in spite of the fact that Imam Ali (a) himself says in his sermon of Qasiya in *Nahjul Balagha:*

> "I used to follow him like a young camel following in the footprints of its mother. Every day he would show me in the form of a banner some of his high traits and commanded me to follow it."[19]

As a result of accepting this marriage, Amirul Momineen (a) would have opposed the practice of the Messenger of Allah (s) and it is not possible for Amirul Momineen (a) to go against his practice.

H. Necessity of compatibility in marriage

Through the study of the religious, moral and genealogical personality of the Second Caliph of Ahle Sunnat and comparing it to the personality of Umme Kulthum, we conclude that these two were not similar in any aspect.

Umme Kulthum was a (grand) daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) and she was brought up in the lap of Lady Fatima Zahra (s), but the Second Caliph of Ahle Sunnat (according the confession of Ahle Sunnat traditional reporters) grew up, for most of his life, in an atmosphere of idolatry and in the laps of women like Hantama.

Ahle Sunnat scholars have themselves clearly narrated the nasty disposition of the Second Caliph of Ahle Sunnat, whereas Umme Kulthum was a young child and from a family, which was an exemplar of good morals and nature for all the people of the world.

Umme Kulthum was aged only seven or eight years of age at the most while the Second Caliph of Ahle Sunnat was at least fifty-seven; can this marriage be considered fair in any way?

We would arrange these comparisons in order and study the absence of equality of the Second Ahle Sunnat Caliph with Umme Kulthum through the books of Ahle Sunnat:

1. Inequality of a Hashemite to a non-Hashemite

Some Ahle Sunnat scholars have clarified that in marriage, it is necessary that there should be religious and genealogical equality and non-Quraish cannot marry Quraishite girls. In the same way, non-Bani Hashim cannot marry Bani Hashim girls, because Bani Hashim, due to their relation with the Messenger of Allah (s) possess excellence over others and no community is equal to them in this superiority.

That is why Amirul Momineen (a) said: I have kept aside my daughters for the sons of Ja'far and I will not give my daughters to anyone else in marriage.

Umar bin Khattab sought from Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) the hand of his daughter, Umme Kulthum. Ali replied: I have prohibited my daughters from marrying anyone else other than the sons of Ja'far.[20]

Muqaddasi Hanbali quoting from Ahmad bin Hanbal writes:

> It is narrated from Ahmad bin Hanbal that a non-Quraishite is not (*Kafwa*) equal to Quraishite. And non-Bani Hashim is not equal to Bani Hashim, because the Messenger of Allah (s) said: the Almighty Allah

> chose Kanana from the progeny of Ismail and from Kanana, He chose Quraish. And from Quraish, He chose Bani Hashim, and He chose me from Bani Hashim.[21]

Can – God forbid – the family and lineage of Umar be compared to that of Umme Kulthum? Whether – we seek the forgiveness of Allah – Sahhak can become equal and compatible with Lady Khadija (s) and Hantama be compared to Lady Zahra (s), who is the chief of the ladies of Paradise? Can – refuge of the Almighty Allah – Khattab can be considered equal to the Messenger of Allah (s) and Amirul Momineen (a)?

If we consider Umme Kulthum to be the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a), we cannot claim through any aspect that Umar was her equal.

It is interesting that even the Second Ahle Sunnat Calipl considered lineage equality to be a necessary condition o marriage and always stopped persons of low class families to marry in noble families.

Sarakhsi Hanafi, a senior Ahle Sunnat scholar, writes in the book of *Mabsut:*

> It is narrated from Umar that he said: I prohibit marriage to ladies, except that they should be equal with them (compatible) and it is due to the fact that equality in marriage is necessary.[22]

And Abdur Razzaq Sanani writes:

> It is narrated from Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Talha that Umar said: I prohibit persons having nobility of lineage from marriage, except that his partner should be equal to him.[23]

But did the Second Caliph himself observe this rule? Did equality of lineage and community exist between Umme Kulthum and the Second Caliph?

2. Inequality of a man aged 57 with a seven years old girl

Similarity of age is a necessary matter, which should be observed in marriage between two persons. By chance, the Second Caliph, himself was opposed to the marriage of young girls to aged men.

Saeed bin Mansur writes in his *Sunan:*

> A young girl had been married to an aged man and after that her husband was killed. She came to Umar. Umar said: O people, fear Allah! Every man should marry a female of his age (his equal and compatible) and every female should marry a male who is her equal.[24]

Was similarity of ages observed in the marriage of Umar with Umme Kulthum?

According to the narration of Ahle Sunnat, this marriage took place in the 17th year of migration (*Hijrat*). Thus, Ibne Athir Jazari also writes:

> In the seventeenth year of migration (*Hijrat*), Umar married Umme Kulthum, daughter of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a), who was a child of Fatima, daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s) and the marriage was consummated in the month of Zilqad.[25]

Umme Kulthum, who was born in the last year of the Holy Prophet (s), at the time of Umar's proposal she was not more than 7 or 8 years old. Thus, Ibne Saad has hinted to this fact and he writes:

> Umar married Umme Kulthum while she had not even reached maturity.[26]

On the other hand, Umar bin Khattab was killed in the year of 23 A.H. aged 63 years; thus, in 17 A.H. he was 57 years old; that is between Umar and Umme Kulthum there was a difference of at least 50 years.

Our question to Ahle Sunnat is that what similarity and equality existed between Umme Kulthum aged seven years and Umar bin Khattab aged fifty-seven years?

Abu Bakr and Umar, who were in those days very young, had sought the hand of her mother, Lady Zahra (s) who was aged nine years, and the Holy Prophet (s) considered absence of equality to be a proof against their proposal.

Ibne Hibban in his *Sahih*, and Nasai and his *Sunan*, has written:

> Abdullah bin Buraidah has narrated from his father that Abu Bakr and Umar had asked for the hand of Fatima in marriage, the Holy Prophet (s) said: Fatima is young. After that Ali (a) proposed, the Holy Prophet (s) gave her in marriage to Ali (a).[27]

After a passage of so many years, how did this equality of age appear between the youngest child of Lady Zahra (s) and Abu Bakr and Umar?

Since Amirul Momineen (a) was not in favor of this marriage he repeated the same statement, which the Messenger of Allah (s) had said to Abu Bakr and Umar at the time they had asked for the hand of Lady Fatima (s). He said: Umme Kulthum is young in age.

We ask the Wahabi scholars: What was the similarity or equality between fifty-seven years old Umar and seven years old Umme Kulthum?

How according to the Ahle Sunnat traditional reports Second Caliph considered equality of ages necessary for others and prohibited old men from marrying young girls; but did not observe this rule himself and married a girl, who had not come of age.

Was this act not an implication of the following verse of Quran?

> "What! do you enjoin men to be good and neglect your own souls while you read the Book; have you then no sense?" (Surah Baqarah 2:44)

3. Inequality in moral behavior

Having moral capability is a condition in every marriage as all intellectuals are bound to it. It is natural that no one gives his daughter brought up in an atmosphere of love and affection to a person of an extremely nasty disposition.

On the other hand, the ill temper of Umar to people, especially to members of his family was well known and clear; so much so that this matter was a cause of rejection of many of his proposals.

4. Refusal of Utbah's daughter to marry Umar

According to the statement of numerous contemporary historians, Yazid bin Abu Sufyan died and Umar proposed to his widow Umme Aban, daughter of Utbah. She did not accept and justified her decision as follows:

> Umar bin Khattab enters the house in a stern and harsh appearance and goes out stern and surly; he keeps the door locked (does not permit his wife to go out) and his goodness (maturity) to his wife is very less.[28]

5. Refusal of Abu Bakr's daughter to marry Umar

Those who try to prove at any cost, the marriage of the Second Caliph with the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) and not with the daughter of Abu Bakr, consider refusal of Abu Bakr's daughter to marriage with Umar due to the harsh nature and ill temper of Umar as proof of this matter. According to the narration of Abde Barr, Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr said to her sister, Ayesha:

> Do you want to marry one about whose ill temper and harsh nature I am aware?...By God, if you try to persuade me for this I will go the grave of the Messenger of Allah (s) and complain to him.[29]

We see that even a young girl like Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr is not prepared to marry Umar, who is the Caliph of Muslims and was a close friend and companion of her father, Abu Bakr. Now, how can it be possible that Amirul Momineen (a) overlooked this moral quality of Umar and handed over his young daughter to him?

6. Beating up the wife

The Second Ahle Sunnat Caliph had the habit of beating up ladies. Ibne Majah Qazwini in his *Sunan*, which is one of the books of *Sihah Sitta* of Ahle Sunnat, writes: Ashath says:

> One night I was a guest of Umar. In the middle of the night I saw Umar beating up his wife. I arose and separated them. When he returned to his bed, he said: O Ashath, remember a point from me. I heard from the Messenger of Allah (s) that no one has the right to ask a man why he beats up his wife.[30]

7. Inequality due to wine-drinking

According to the view of Ahle Sunnat scholar, it is not allowed to give a daughter in marriage to an imbiber of wine. An imbiber of wine cannot be an equal to the daughter of a Muslim and one who commits this act has in fact cut off relations.

Apart from the points mentioned above, Abdur Razzaq Sanani, who is considered to be the teacher of Bukhari, writes in his *Musannaf:*

> Umar bin Khattab, during a journey was a companion of a man who was fasting; at the time of breaking the

> fast, he drank from the leather bag of wine belonging to Umar and which the camel had shaken up, and he became intoxicated by it. Umar awarded him the penalty for drinking wine. That person objected: I drank from your leather bag. Umar said: I have not punished you for drinking wine; I have punished you for becoming intoxicated.[31]

Ibne Abde Barr has written in *Iqdul Farid:*

> Shobi says that a Bedouin drank wine from the leather bag of Umar and became intoxicated. Umar awarded the legal penalty. Awarding the penalty was not for drinking wine, but for becoming intoxicated.[32]

As can be observed, we have quoted these traditional reports from Ahle Sunnat sources and not from Shia sources; hence the responsibility of narrating such types of traditional reports should also be on them.

8. Inequality in faith

According to the opinion of Ahle Sunnat scholars, religious equality is another condition for marriage. Abu Talib Makki has quoted from Sufyan Thawri that:

> Thawri says: When a man sends a proposal and asks: How much wealth does this girl owns? You should know that he is a cheater and you should not give your daughter to him. In the same way, do not give daughter to a heretic, sinner, oppressor, wine imbiber or usurer. If one goes against it, he destroys his religion, cuts off his relations and has not been a good guardian to his daughter, because he has, through this act, omitted goodness to his daughter. Such people are not eligible to marry daughters of free Muslims.[33]

Ibne Qudama Maqdasi, the most important Hanbali jurist, has clarified: Religious equality is a condition in marriage and a sinner cannot marry a pious female. Then he quotes from Ahmad bin Hanbal:

> No community is equal in status to Bani Hashim and cannot marry in them. Equal is one who is religious and commands respect. That is why sinners are not eligible to marry pious ladies, because the testimony of a sinner is invalid...It is narrated from Ahmad bin Hanbal that a non-Quraishite is not (*Kafwa*) equal to Quraishite; and non-Bani Hashim person is not equal to Bani Hashim, because the Messenger of Allah (s) said: The Almighty Allah chose Kanana from the progeny of Ismail and from Kanana, He chose Quraish; and from Quraish, He chose Bani Hashim; and He chose me from Bani Hashim.[34]

Now, with attention to what was mentioned in the statement of Ibne Qudama, the Second Caliph cannot marry the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) in any way, because he was neither from Bani Hashim, nor having any religious equality with Umme Kulthum.

That he was not from Bani Hashim, there is no scope for doubt in it. As for the fact that he was also unequal to Umme Kulthum from religious point of view, authentic traditions in Ahle Sunnat books prove this point.

First report (Unjust and sinner)

Teacher of Bukhari, Abdur Razzaq Sanani through his own reliable chains of narrators has narrated from the Second Caliph who addressed Abbas and Amirul Momineen (a) thus:

> I ruled for two years after Abu Bakr and continued the practice of the Prophet and Abu Bakr, but you two consider me an oppressor and sinner.[35]

Second report (Liar, sinner, cheater and deceptive)

Muslim Nishapuri has also narrated from Umar bin Khattab in his *Sahih* that he addressed Amirul Momineen (a) and his uncle, Abbas as follows:

When Abu Bakr passed away and (I have become) the successor of the Messenger of Allah (s) and Abu Bakr, you two thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest...[36]

This was the real belief of Amirul Momineen (a) with regard to the First and Second Caliph, because firstly: there is no proof that Umar issued a statement against himself and that also from the tongue of the most distinguished persons of the Ummah; secondly Amirul Momineen (a) also did not deny the statement of the Caliph. Thirdly: This statement was mentioned in the final days of Umar's Caliphate and it proves that His Eminence was having this belief till the end of his Caliphate.

According to another report that Bukhari has narrated in the most authentic book of Ahle Sunnat after Holy Quran: The hypocrite has four qualities: lying, dishonesty, deception and sinfulness. According to the two reports mentioned previously from Ahle Sunnat books, all these qualities were present in the Second Caliph and Amirul Momineen (a) has only approved them.

It is narrated from the Messenger of Allah (s) that there are three signs of a hypocrite: when he speaks, he lies, when he promises, he breaks the promise and when he is trusted, he betrays the trust.[37]

In the same way, it is narrated from the Messenger of Allah (s) that he said:

The Prophet said, "Whoever has the following four (characteristics) will be a pure hypocrite and whoever

has one of the following four characteristics will have one characteristic of hypocrisy unless and until he gives it up. -1. Whenever he is entrusted, he betrays. -2. Whenever he speaks, he tells a lie. -3. Whenever he makes a covenant, he proves treacherous. -4. Whenever he quarrels, he behaves in a very imprudent, evil and insulting manner."[38]

The conclusion is that according to what was mentioned above, the Second Caliph of Ahle Sunnat was not having equality with Umme Kulthum. On the basis of this, there was no possibility of Amirul Momineen (a) overlooking these conditions and giving his daughter in marriage to one who was not her equal in any aspect.

At the most, what can be said is that if this marriage was approved by Amirul Momineen (a), it would have been same as in the case of Prophet Lut (a) and acceptance of marriage of his sinful people with his daughters was only a suggestion and not for the sake of good relations and attachment to them, on the contrary, it was to keep them away from the evil habit of sodomy.[39]

I. Justification of Shia traditional reports

In Shia books also there are traditional reports on this subject, but through their study it is concluded that these traditional reports are:

Firstly: They do not prove the marriage of the biological daughter of Amirul Momineen (a); on the contrary, it can prove that she was the same Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr, who is mentioned as the adopted daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) and who lived in the house of Amirul Momineen (a).

Secondly: If she had been the real daughter of Amirul Momineen (a), it does not prove that she was the child of Lady Fatima Zahra (s).

Thirdly: These traditional reports not only disprove friendly relations between Amirul Momineen (a) and Umar bin Khattab; on the contrary, they prove use of force by Umar in order to achieve his selfish aims.

The Late Kulaini has narrated this traditional report in *Al-Kafi* as follows:

> Hisham bin Saalim has narrated from Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a) that he said: When Umar bin Khattab asked for the hand of Umme Kulthum, Amirul Momineen (a) said: Umme Kulthum is young of age. Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a) said: Umar met Abbas and said: In what a great difficulty I am? Abbas asked: What happened? He replied: I asked your nephew for the hand of his daughter [please note that an adopted daughter is also referred to as a daughter], but he rejected it. By God, he has filled up the Zamzam well, no excellence remains for you anymore and I will bring two witnesses to testify that Ali (a) has committed theft and due to this I would have his hands cut off. Abbas came to Amirul Momineen (a) and related the whole incident to him, and requested him to leave the decision to him. Imam (a) also left the matter to Abbas.[40]

2. Abdullah bin Sinan and Muawiyah bin Ammar say: we asked Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a) regarding a widow that where is she supposed to observe her waiting period. Imam (a) said: She can observe the waiting period anywhere she likes. Then he said: When Umar died, Ali (a) brought Umme Kulthum to his house.[41]

3. Sulaiman bin Khalid says: I asked Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a) regarding a widow, whether she is supposed to observe her waiting period at the house of her departed husband or she can observe it anywhere she likes. Imam (a) said: She can observe

the waiting period anywhere she likes. Then he said: When Umar died, Imam Ali (a) brought Umme Kulthum to his house.[42]

4. They asked Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a) regarding the marriage of Umme Kulthum. Imam (a) replied: She was a lady whom they usurped from us.[43]

Wahabis cannot prove their claims through these traditional reports, because even if we leave aside these reports, and suppose that the marriage took place, it cannot in any way prove good relations between Amirul Momineen (a) and Umar bin Khattab; on the contrary, it proves bad relations between them, because at the most that which is proved from these reports is a marriage with threats and force and that too with a young girl, who herself did not agree to it nor her father.

Can such a marriage be regarded as excellence for Umar bin Khattab and can it prove cordial relations and friendship between the Second Caliph and Amirul Momineen (a)?

Sayyid Murtaza says in this regard:

> The remarkable point in the marriage of Umme Kulthum is that this marriage was not with her choice and to her liking, on the contrary, it was performed after repeated requests and threats and it was near that it should have been through use of force...compulsion legalizes carrion and wine, so what can be said for lesser things [marriage].[44]

J. Forced marriage of Umar with Atkia

Now, whether the marriage of Umar with Umme Kulthum did really take place or not; or whether she was the daughter of Abu Bakr or she was the adopted daughter of Amirul Momineen (a); whether she was the biological daughter of the Imam from other wives; it was not the first forced marriage of

Umar bin Khattab, on the contrary, it happened before this also. The marriage of Atika, daughter of Zaid was another example of forced marriage, in which it is mentioned at the end that it was so painful to Atika that she screamed so much that Umar fled the scene. Muhammad bin Saad has mentioned in *Tabaqatul Kubra:*

> Ali bin Zaid says: Atika, the daughter of Zaid was the wife of Abdullah bin Abu Bakr and Abdullah had imposed a condition to her that if he died, she must not remarry. Atika did not remarry after the death of Abdullah and did not accept the offer of anyone to marry her. Umar said to the guardian of Atika: Ask Atika for her hand on my behalf. Atika rejected the proposal of Umar as well. Umar said to her guardian: You get her married to me in any way and the rituals of marriage were completed. Umar came to her and forced her to share his bed. When the deed was over, Atika said a number of times by way of expression of abhorrence: Uff, uff. After that Umar went out and did not return till the guardian of Atika sent message to Umar to send someone so that I can hand her to you again.[45]

In the end, once again we repeat the conclusions derived from the above long discussion:

Firstly: Basically the existence of a real daughter of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) named Umme Kulthum is doubtful and some Shia and Sunni scholars have right away denied the existence of such a daughter.

Secondly, the Umme Kulthum who married Umar was the daughter of Abu Bakr and not Amirul Momineen (a).

Thirdly: Supposing that such marriage with the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a) had taken place, she was from other wives of His Eminence and not Lady Zahra (s);

Fourthly: According to Ahle Sunnat reports, even if this marriage took place in any way, not only does it disprove good relations, on the contrary, it exposes the shamelessness and immodesty of the Second Ahle Sunnat Caliph;

Fifthly: This marriage, according to Shia and Sunni traditional reports, took place with force and threats. On the basis of this, it does in any way prove good relations between Amirul Momineen (a) and the Second Caliph.

NOTES

[1] For more information refer:

Al-Masailul Akbariya wal Masailul Ruwiya, Shaykh Mufeed (d. 413 A.H.) – Tazweej Umme Kulthum Li Umar, Sayyid Murtaza Alamul Huda (d. 436 A.H.) – *Risala fee Tazweej Umar Li Umme Kulthum binte Ali (a)*, Shaykh Sulaiman bin Abdullah Mahuzi (d. 1121 A.H.) – *Qauli Mahtoom fee Aqd Umme Kulthum*, Sayyid Karamatali Hindi, India, 1311 A.H. – *Al-Ijlatul Mafhama fee Ibtalil Rawayat Nikah Umme Kulthum* (Persian), Sayyid Mustafa Ibne Sayyid Muhammad Hadi bin Mahdi bin Dildar Ali Naqvi (d. 1323 A.H.) – *Kanze Maktum fee hal Aqd Umme Kulthum*, Vol. 4, Pg. 140, Tr. 4399, Kitabal Hudud, Baab fil Majnun Yasriq aw Yusibu Haddan, Sayyid Ali Azhar Hindi Khajwi (d. 1352 A.H.) – *Tazweej Umme Kulthum binte Amirul Momineen (a) wa Inkar Waqua*, Shaykh Muhammad Jawad Balaghi (d. 1352 A.H.) – *Zawaj Umme Kulthum*, Sayyid Ali Shahristani (contemporary) – *Ifhamul Aada wal Khusum bi Takzib Maftaru Alaa Sayyiditina Umme Kulthum Alaihas Salam Hayyil Qayyum*, Musawi Hindi, Sayyid Nasir Husain (contemporary) – *Fee Khabar Tazweej Umme Kulthum min Umar*, Sayyid Ali Milani (contemporary) and...

[2] *Ad-Adadal Qawiyya Lidifa Makhaufil Yaumiya*, Pg. 242, Raziuddin Ali bin Yusuf Mutahhar Hilli (d. 705 A.H.), Edited: Sayyid Mahdi Rajai, Maktabe Ayatullah Marashi, Qom, First edition, 1408 A.H.

[3] *Sharh Ahqaqul Haqq wa Izhaqul batil*, Vol. 30, Pg. 172, Ayatullah Sayyid Shahabuddin Marashi Najafi (d. 1369 solar), Maktabe Ayatullah Uzma Marashi Najafi - Qom.

[4] *Hayat Sayyiditunnisa Fatima Zahra (s)*, Baqir Sharif Qarashi (contemporary), Pg. 219.

[5] *Sobolul Huda war Rishaad fee Seerat Khairul Ibaad*, Vol. 11, Pg. 288, Muhammad, bin Yusuf Salihi Shami (d. 942 A.H.), Edited: Adil Ahmad Abdul Maujud – Ali Muhammad Maudh, Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, First edition, 1414 A.H.

[6] *Hashiya Qalyuwi Alaa Sharh Jalaluddin Mahallai Alaa Minhajut Talibiyyin*, Vol. 3, Pg. 236; Shahabuddin Ahmad bin Ahmad bin Salama Qalyubi (d. 1069 A.H.), Edited: Maktabe Bahoos wad Darasaat, Darul Fikr, Beirut, First Edition, 1419 A.H. – 1998 A.D.

[7] *Noorul Yaqeen fee Seerat Sayyidul Mursaleen*, Vol. 1, Pg. 111, Shaykh Muhammad Khizri (d. 1298 A.H.), Edited: Ahmad Mahmud Khattab, Maktabaul Imaan, Mansura, Egypt, First edition, 1419 A.H. – 1999 A.D.

[8] *Tahdhibul Asma wal Lughat*, Vol. 2, Pg. 630, No. 1224, Abu Zakariya Muhiuddin Yahya nm Sharaf bin Mari Nawawi (d. 676 A.H.), Edited: Maktabe bahut wad Darasat, Darul Fikr, Beirut, First edition, 1996 A.D.

[9] *Sharh Ahqaqul Haqq wa Azhaqul Batil*, Vol. 30, Pg. 315, Ayatullah Sayyid Shahabuddin Marashi Najafi (d. 1369 solar), Manshurat Maktabe Ayatullah Uzma Marashi Najafi – Qom.

[10] *Al-Mahbar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 403, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Habib bin Umayyah Baghdadi (d. 245 A.H.).

[11] *Musannaf*, Vol. 6, Pg. 163, tradition 10352, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[12] *Tarikh Medina Damishq wa Zikr Fadhlaha wa Tasmiya man Halha minal Amail*, Vol. 19, Pg. 483, Abul Qasim Ali bin Hasan Ibne Hibtullah bin Abdullah Shafei, (d. 571 A.H.), Darul Fikr, Beirut, 1995, Edited: Mohibbuddin Abi Saeed Umar bin Ghurama Umari;

[13] *Tarikh Baghdad*, Vol. 6, Pg. 182, Ahmad bin Ali Abu Bakr Khatib Baghdadi (d. 463 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut.

[14] *Musannaf*, Vol. 7, Pg. 286, tradition 13200, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[15] *Musannaf*, Vol. 7, Pg. 286, tradition 13202, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[16] *Tadkiratul Khawas*, Pg. 288-289, Shamsuddin Abul Muzaffar Yusuf bin Farghali bin Abdullah Sibte bin Jauzi Hanafi Baghdadi, Mausisa Ahle Bayt – Beirut, 1401 A.H. – 1981 A.D.

[17] *Sawaiqul Mohriqa Alaa Ahle Rafdh, wa Zalaal wa Zandiqa*, Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ali Ibne Hajar Haithami (d. 973 A.H.), Vol. 2, Pg. 471, Mausasitur Risala – Lebanon – 1417 A.H. – 1997 A.D. 1st edition, Abdur Rahman bin Abdullah Turki – Kamil Muhammad Kharat.

[18] *Al-Mujtaba minas Sunan*, Vol. 6, Pg. 62, Ahmad bin Shuaib Abu Abdur Rahman Nasai, Edited: Abdul Fattah Abu Ghida, Maktaba Matbuat Islamiya, Aleppo, Second edition, 1406-1986;

Sahih Ibne Hibban ba Tarteeb Ibne Balban, Vol. 15, Pg. 399, Muhammad bin Habban bin Ahmad Abu Hatim Tamimi Basti, (d. 354 A.H.) Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Mausisatur Risala – Beirut, Second edition, 1414 A.H. – 1993 A.D.

[19] *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermons of Imam Ali (a), Vol. 2, Pg. 157, Sermon 198, Sermon of Qasiya.

[20] *Sunan Saeed bin Mansur*, Vol. 1, Pg. 172, Tr. 520, Saeed bin Mansur Khorasani (d. 227 A.H.), Edited: Habibur Rahman Azami, Darul Salafiya, India, First edition, 1403 A.H. – 1982 A.D.

Tabaqatul Kubra, Vol. 8, Pg. 463, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Saad bin Mani Basri Zuhri (d. 230 A.H.), Daar Sadir – Beirut.

[21] *Al-Kafi fee Fiqh al-Imamil Mabjal Ahmad bin Hanbal*, Vol. 3, Pg. 31, Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Qudama Abu Muhammad Muqaddasi (d. 623 A.H.), Maktabul Islami – Beirut.

[22] *Al-Mabsut*, Vol. 4, Pg. 196, Shamsuddin Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abi Sahal Sarakhsi (d. 483 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut.

[23] *Musannaf*, Vol. 6, Pg. 152, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi.

[24] *Sunan Saeed bin Mansur*, Vol. 1, Pg. 243, Tr. 809, Saeed bin Mansur Khorasani (d. 227 A.H.), Edited: Habibur Rahman Azami, Darul Salafiya, India, First edition, 1403 A.H. – 1982 A.D.

Jamiul Ahadith (*Al-Jame Saghir wa Zawaida wa Jamiul Kabir*), Vol. 14, Pg. 263, Jalaluddin Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.)

Al-Ifsaah Anil Ahadithun Nikah, Vol. 1, Pg. 32, Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ali Ibne Hajar Haithami, (d. 973 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Shakoor Amrir Miyadini, Daare Ammar – Amman – Jordan, First edition, 1406.

[25] *Al-Kamil fit Tarikh*, Vol. 2, Pg. 382, Izzuddin bin Athir Abul Hasan Ali bin Muhammad Jazari (d. 630 A.H.), Edited: Abdullah Qadi, Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut, Second edition, 1415 A.H.

[26] *Tabaqatul Kubra*, Vol. 8, Pg. 463, Muhammad bin Saad bin Mani Abu Abdullah Basri Zuhri (d. 230 A.H.), Dar Sadir – Beirut.

[27] *Khasais Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib*, Vol. 1, Pg. 136, Ahmad bin Shuaib Abu Abdur Rahman Nasai (d. 303 A.H.), Edited: Ahmad Mircen Baloshi, Maktabe Mualla - Kuwait, First edition, 1406 A.H.

Al-Mujtaba minas Sunan, Vol. 6, Pg. 62, Ahmad bin Shuaib Abu Abdur Rahman Nasai, Edited: Abdul Fattah Abu Ghida, Maktaba Matbuat Islamiya, Aleppo, Second edition, 1406-1986

[28] *Ansabul Ashraf*, Vol. 3, Pg. 260, Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir Balazari (d. 279 A.H.).

Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 564, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari, (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiyya, Beirut.

Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya, Vol. 7, Pg. 139, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Abul Fida Qarashi Damishqi (d. 774 A.H.), Maktabul Marif – Beirut.

[29] *Al-Istiab fee Marifatul Ashab*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1807, Yusuf bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abde Barr (d. 463), Darul Jeel, Beirut, 1412, First edition, Edited: Ali Muhammad Bajawi.

[30] *Sunan Ibne Majah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 639, Tr. 1986, Baab Zarbin Nisa, Muhammad bin Yazid Abu Abdullah Qazwini (d. 275 A.H.), Edited Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Fikr Beirut.

Al-Ahadithul Mukhtara, Vol. 1, Pg. 189, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Abdul Wahid bin Ahmad Hanbali Muqaddasi (d. 643 A.H.), Maktaba Nahzatul Haditha, Mecca – 1410, First edition, Edited: Abdul Malik bin Abdullah bin Dahish.

Tahdhibul Kamaal, Vol. 18, Pg. 31, Yusuf bin Zaki Abdur Rahman Abul Hajjaj al-Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Bishar Awad Maruf, Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, First edition, 1400 A.H. – 1980 A.D.

Tafsir Quranil Azeem, Vol. 1, Pg. 493, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Abul Fida Qarshi Damishqi (d. 774), Darul Fikr – Beirut – 1401 A.H.

[31] *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 5, Pg. 502, tradition 28401, Abu Bakr Abdur Razzaq bin Hamam Sanani (d. 211), Darul Nashr Maktabul Islami, Beirut – 1403, Second edition, Edited: Habibur Rahman Azmi

[32] *Al-Iqdul Farid*, Vol. 6, Pg. 382; Ahmad bin Muhammad Ibne Abde Rabb Andulasi, (d. 328 A.H.), Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut, Lebanon, Second edition, 1420 A.H. – 1999 A.D.

[33] *Quwwatul Quloob fee Mamlatul Mahbub wa wast Tareeqal*

Mureed Ilaa Maqamal Tauheed, Vol. 2, Pg. 414, Muhammad bin Ali bin Atiyya Harithi, Abu Talib Makki (d. 286 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Asim Ibrahim Kiyali, Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, Second edition, 1426 A.H.- 2005 A.D.

[34] *Al-Kafi fee Fiqh al-Imamil Mabjal Ahmad bin Hanbal*, Vol. 3, Pg. 31, Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Qudama Abu Muhammad Muqaddasi (d. 623 A.H.), Maktabul Islami – Beirut.

[35] *Al-Kitabul Musannaf fee al-Ahadith wal Aathaar*, Vol. 5, Pg. 469, Tradition no. 9772, Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abi Shaybah Kufi (d. 235 A.H.), Edited: Kamaal Yusuf Alhut; Maktabe Rushd, Riyadh, First edition, 1409 A.H.

[36] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1378, Tr. no. 1757, Kitabul Jihad wa Sayr, Baab Hukm al-Fayy, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[37] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 21, Tr. no. 33, Kitabul Imaan, Baab Alamaat Munfiq, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d, 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[38] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 21, Tr. no. 34, Kitabul Imaan, Baab Alamaat Munfiq, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d, 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[39] *"And his people came to him, (as if) rushed on towards him, and already they did evil deeds. He said: O my people! these are my daughters- they are purer for you, so guard against (the punishment of) Allah and do not disgrace me with regard to my guests; is there not among you one right-minded man?" (Surah Hud 11:78)*

[40] *Al-Usul min Kafi*, Vol. 5, Pg. 346, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Yaqub bin Ishaq Kulaini Razi (d. 328 A.H.), Islamiya, Tehran, 2nd Edition, 1362 A.H.

[41] *Al-Usul min Kafi*, Vol. 6, Pg. 115, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Yaqub bin Ishaq Kulaini Razi (d. 328 A.H.), Islamiya, Tehran, 2nd Edition, 1362 A.H.

[42] *Al-Usul min Kafi*, Vol. 6, Pg. 115, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin

Yaqub bin Ishaq Kulaini Razi (d. 328 A.H.), Islamiya, Tehran, 2nd Edition, 1362 A.H.

[43] *Al-Usul min Kafi*, Vol. 5, Pg. 346, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Yaqub bin Ishaq Kulaini Razi (d. 328 A.H.), Islamiya, Tehran, 2nd Edition, 1362 A.H.

[44] *Rasailul Murtaza*, Vol. 3, Pg. 149, Abul Qasim Ali bin Husain bin Musa bin Muhammad bin Musa bin Ibrahim bin Imam Musa Kazim (a), Murtaza Alamul Huda (d. 436 A.H.), Edited with notes by Sayyid Ahmad Husaini, Sayyid Mahdi Rajai, Darul Quranal Kareem – Qom, 1405 A.H.

[45] *Tabaqatul Kubra*, Vol. 8, Pg. 265, Muhammad bin Saad bin Mani Abu Abdullah Basri Zuhri (d. 230 A.H.), Dar Sadir – Beirut

OBJECTION 20:
AYATULLAH KHOEI HAS DENIED ATTACK ON FATIMA'S HOUSE

EXPLANATION

The Wahabis, in one of their objections have tried to show the Point of Reference (*Maraja Taqlid*) of Shia, Ayatullah Uzma Sayyid Abul Qasim Khoei as a denier of the incident of attack on Fatima's house. In their objections, they say:

> Ayatullah Khoei was asked: Are reports about the breaking of the ribs genuine? He replied: According the popular view among the scholars, they are not. (*Siratun Najah*, Vol. 2, Pg. 314)

LOGICAL REPLY

With reference to the book in question and study of the question and answers mentioned in it, the exposure of the proponents of this doubt would be clearer than before and the actual statement of Ayatullah Uzma Khoei (r) will be the best reply to this allegation. Therefore, we have quoted the actual question as follows leaving the decision to awakened consciences so that they may see how Wahabis play with the views of people in order to achieve their aims.

Text of the question and reply of Ayatullah Uzma Khoei

Question 980: Are the report and statements, which speakers have mentioned from the pulpits and some writers have stated in their books, which say that Umar had broken the ribs of Fatima (s), genuine in your view?

Reply: These reports are famous and well known. (*Siratun Najah*, Vol. 3, Pg. 314)

OBJECTION 21:
SHIA, DUE TO THEIR CURSING AND ABUSING OF COMPANIONS, BECOME DISBELIEVERS

EXPLANATION OF THE OBJECTION

Among the excuses that since long are used to legalize the plunder of the properties of Shia, labeling them as infidels and slaying them, is the topic of cursing and abusing[1] the companions, especially Abu Bakr and Umar.

Among the events of the year 407 A.H. was the killing of Shia in Africa. All the Shia who remained there were pursued and put to death...for the crime that they were *Rafidi* (Shia) and because they abused Abu Bakr and Umar...that is why people rose up against them, created mischief and eliminated them in greed of plundering their properties.[2]

At one time, among the old allegations of Wahabis on the Shi was that they curse and abuse all companions and one wh curses a companion of the Messenger of Allah (s) has in fa been disrespectful of the Messenger of Allah (s) and one who is disrespectful to him, is a disbeliever and he deserves to be killed.

Most astonishing is that Ahle Sunnat jurisprudents have time and again issued verdicts that one who abuses Abu Bakr and Umar becomes liable for execution, but when it is the turn of Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) we don't see such verdicts. On the contrary, a large number of those who have abused His Eminence or have fought against him are approved, respected and considered reliable, which we shall illustrate and explain in the coming discussions.

There are many views in this regard and we present some of them by way of examples:

Ibne Taymiyyah considered abusing Amirul Momineen (a) to be of lesser significance than abusing other Caliphs

Ibne Taymiyyah, the great proponent of Wahabi views, who is given the title of Shaykhul Islam by them and who has heaped innumerable insults on Shia,[3] regarding this, he says:

> Doubtlessly, it is not lawful to curse or abuse any of the companions, neither cursing and abusing Ali nor Uthman or anyone else. Sin of one who abuses Ali is less than the sin of one who abuses Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. If one is having justification of abusing Ali, he is not having justification of abusing Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman. Soldiers of Muawiyah are not blamable and if anyone is more blamable, it is the Shia, because they abuse the first three caliphs, whereas a *Nasibi* only curses Ali.[4]

Labeling Shia as apostates, because of cursing the companions in the verdicts of Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia

Bin Jibrin, who was one of the greatest contemporary Wahabi scholars till his death was the Mufti of Saudi Arabia.[5] In one of his verdicts, he has considered Shia as disbelievers, because of considering companions as disbelievers:

> Doubtlessly, Shia are disbelievers for four reasons:...2- Since companions are disbelievers in their view...[6]

Congregation leader (Imam Jamat) of Masjidul Haraam does not consider as Muslim, one who curses Abu Bakr

Shaykh Aadil Saalim Kalbani, the first African black congregation leader of Masjidul Haraam in recent years[7], in an interview to BBC, has stated as follows:

> I cannot accept as Muslim, one who condemns and curses the First Caliph and doubtlessly such a person is a disbeliever.

Verdicts justifying the killings of Shia due to the crime of abusing and cursing the companions

When Sultan Murad, the fourth Ottoman king decided to attack the Persians, he wanted to have his decision Shariat-approved by his unscrupulous scholars. So he asked them to issue verdicts legalizing bloodshed of Shia that he may continue with his objective. Except for one unscrupulous scholar, who is mentioned under his satanic verdict, no scholar supported his demand:

1- An unscrupulous Turkish scholar, named Nuh Afandi said in his verdict against the Shia as follows:

> Paradise is obligatorily awarded to one who kills a *Rafidi* (one who according to their definition abuses Abu Bakr and Umar).[8]

This verdict caused killing of thousands of Shia people in these battles.[9]

2- Ibne Hajar Asqalani, commentator of *Sahih Bukhari*, says:

> There is difference of opinion regarding one, who abuses the companions...some scholars of the Maliki sect have issued verdicts that such a person should be executed.[10]

3- The Grand Mufti of the Hanafiyyah sect says:

> One, who has doubt about one of the companions, is a disbeliever and if he does not repent, he goes out of the pale of Islam and is liable for execution.[11]

4- Ibne Nujaim Hanafi says:

> ...If a *Rafidi* (Shia) curses and abuses the two Shaykhs (Abu Bakr and Umar) or ridicules (condemns) them, he is a disbeliever and he should be executed. Now the question is that if he repents and embraces Islam,

should his repentance be accepted or not? Sadr Shaheed, Abu Laith Samarqandi and Abu Nasr Dabusi opine that his repentance and Islam is not acceptable and he should be executed. Our view is also same.[12]

5- Ibne Hazm Andulasi, a great Ahle Sunnat scholar and leader of Zahiriya sect, which is one of their most ancient jurisprudential sects, says:

Malik bin Anas said: One who abuses Ayesha should be executed...Abu Muhammad has said: Abusing Ayesha is a cause of infidelity and apostasy from Islam and it is the denial of the Almighty Allah as He has considered her to be chaste...[13]

6- It is narrated from Suyuti that:

We believe that one who thinks that companions are deserving of abuses, should be burnt up, on the contrary, a punishment more severe than that should be meted out to him.[14]

LOGICAL REPLY

The subject of cursing and abusing has been, since a long time, an excuse for general slaughter and killing of the Shia. In such a way that rulers and those in power, when they wanted to target a person of Shia faith, apprehend and punish him, they used to accuse him for obscenity to and condemnation of companions, especially Abu Bakr and Umar.

The result of this was nothing, but killing of innocent human beings. It is when by a close study of traditional texts approved by Wahabis, we encounter a double and unjustifiable attitude.

A. Double attitude in cursing and abusing of Caliphs

Now, it should be seen whether anyone who tears his collar and madly defends honor of the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s), especially Abu Bakr and Umar, and in opposition

of the declaration of the Holy Quran and authentic traditions issues verdicts for killing of those who abuse the companions and in front of greatest curse and abuse of the most noble, intelligent, just and in one word, the most perfect creature of the world after the Messenger of Allah (s), do they also the same attitude regarding him?

1. The statement of Ibne Taymiyyah, which was mentioned a little while ago:

> ...sin of one who abuses Ali is less than the sin of one who abuses Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. If one is having justification of abusing Ali, he is not having justification of abusing Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman.[15]

Have special traditional reports come down regarding abusing of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, which have not been recorded about the abusing of Ali?

2. Ibne Hazm Andulasi says with regard to the killer of Amirul Momineen (a):

> No Muslim has any doubt that Ibne Muljim performed jurisprudence to kill Amirul Momineen (a) and considered himself right and due to this Imran bin Hattan, a Sifriya poet (a sect of Khawarij) says with regard to the strike of Ibne Muljim:

What a blow that righteous man delivered; as the aim of that blow was nothing, but to gain divine pleasure. Whenever I am reminded of that blow, I find him to be one whose pan of the balance of deeds is heavier than anyone else.[16]

Similar statements have come down in books of some other Ahle Sunnat scholars as well.[17]

3. Ibne Taymiyyah has also, in *Minhajus Sunnah*, mentioned the killer of Amirul Momineen (a) with respect and reverence.

One who killed Ali, recited prayer, kept fasts, recited the Quran and though he was deviated and innovator in these things, he committed the killing of Ali (a) with devotion and love of Allah and His Messenger.[18]

Again, he writes in the same book:

> A Khariji, named Abdur Rahman bin Muljim Muradi killed Ali. He was a man having knowledge and intelligence and was of the most aware and religious persons of his time.[19]

B. Who is a companion according to Shia and Sunni?

In order to clarify the reality of the meaning of 'curse' and implication of Shia of those deserving of curse, it is necessary to explain the two terms: Who is a 'companion' and what is 'curse'?

1. Companions in the view of Shia

Shia cannot, like Ahle Sunnat admit to the justice of all companions and accord them a position higher than that which the Shia accord to the infallibility of Ahle Bayt (a); because Allah, the Mighty and the High says even with regard to the Prophet:

> "Surely if you associate (with Allah), your work would certainly come to naught and you would certainly be of the losers." (39:65)

Or He says about His Prophet:

> "And if he had fabricated against Us some of the sayings, We would certainly have seized him by the right hand. Then We would certainly have cut off his aorta." (69:44-46)

Shia consider the companionship of the Messenger of Allah (s) to be a matter of the greatest pride, but along with inspiration from verses of Allah, prophetic traditions and

sayings of the Imams, they believe that companions can be divided into four groups:

1. Companions who brought faith in the Messenger of Allah (s) and died with this same belief during the lifetime of His Eminence or were martyred fighting alongside the Prophet.

2. Companions, who whether in the beginning remained faithful to their oath with Amirul Momineen (a) or who broke their oath and died on this same belief or were martyred fighting alongside His Eminence.

3. Sinful companions:

> "O you who believe! if an evil-doer comes to you with a report, look carefully into it..." (Surah Hujurat 49:6)

4. Hypocritical companions:

> "And from among those who are round about you of the dwellers of the desert there are hypocrites, and from among the people of Medina (also); they are stubborn in hypocrisy; you do not know them; We know them; We will chastise them twice then shall they be turned back to a grievous chastisement." (Surah Taubah 9:101)

2. Companions in the view of Ahle Sunnat

Bukhari says in the definition of companions:

> Every Muslim, who had been in the company of the Messenger of Allah (s) or has seen him, is a companion.[20]

Ahmad bin Hanbal also says:

> Companions of the Messenger of Allah (s) are all those who have remained in the company of His Eminence for a month, a day or even one hour or who have (only) seen him.[21]

3. Number of companions in the view of Ahle Sunnat

Ibne Jauzi and Suyuti have narrated from Abu Zaraa that he said:

> The Messenger of Allah (s) had 114000 companions when he passed away from the world.[22]

4. View of Ahle Sunnat regarding the companions

Ahle Sunnat consider all companions of the Prophet to be the saints of God, just and the most superior creatures after prophets and the folks of Paradise.

For example, Qurtubi says regarding this:

> All companions are just, divine saints, chosen ones of God and the most superior human beings after prophets and divine messengers. This is the view of all Ahle Sunnat and the leaders of their different sects.[23]

Is this definition of companions not more than what the Shia believe regarding the infallible Imams, who according to the verse of purification are having the position of infallibility?

C. What is curse and abuse?

Among the arguments, which cause allegation against the Shia, is the misunderstanding about the true meaning of abuse and curse; that is why it is necessary to define these two Quranic terms in the beginning.

1. Literal definition of 'curse'

Jauhari in his *Sihah* has defined 'curse' to be as follows:

> 'Curse': Expulsion and driving away from good.[24]

2. Literal definition of 'abuse'

Zubaidi says in *Tajul Uroos*:

> 'Abuse' is in the meaning of 'foul language'.[25]

He has also said in the meaning of 'foul language':

> 'Foul language is bad words and statements and it is not necessary that it should be an allegation.[26]

On the basis of this, from the aspect of literary meaning, there is a great difference between curse and abuse. Curse is only a desire to distance from goodness and abuse denotes use of bad words and foul language.

D. Those who are cursed in Quran

The word of curse is used 41 times in Quran of which most of them are attributed to the Almighty Allah.

The word of abuse is only used once in the Holy Quran and that also as a negative quality, which is prohibited.[27]

Some of those who have been cursed in the Holy Quran are as follows: disbelievers,[28] polytheists, liars and satans...and those who have caused pain to the Holy Prophet (s).[29]

E. Those who are cursed in the words of the Prophet

In a number of statements of the Messenger of Allah (s) many of the companions, who, according to the claim of Ahle Sunnat, are holders of such a lofty position, as we mentioned previously, are cursed as we would be illustrating below:

Persons who were directly targets of the curse of the Messenger of Allah (s) or that His Eminence displayed silent approval when they were cursed are as follows:

1. Hakam bin Aas. 2. Those who were in the loins of Hakam bin Aas (like Marwan, son-in-law of Uthman) 3. Abu Sufyan 4. Yazid bin Abu Sufyan 5. Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan 6. Command to curse one of the wives of His Eminence 7. Silence before the cursing of Abu Bakr 8. Amr bin Aas 9 and 10. Two companions, who caused pain to him. 11. One of the companions, who had intercourse with his slave girl without *Istibra* (purification) 12. Deities of Quraish.

1- Hakam bin Aas 2 – Sons and progeny of Hakam (including Marwan bin Hakam, son-in-law of Uthman)

Hakam bin Aas was among the chiefs of Bani Umayyah. In the issue, which arose between his son, Marwan and Abdur Rahman Ibne Abu Bakr, Ayesha stood up in defense of her brother and announced clearly: The Messenger of Allah (s) cursed Marwan, when he was in the loins of his father.

Nasai has written in his *Sunan*:

> When Muawiyah took allegiance for Yazid, Marwan said: This is the same practice of Abu Bakr and Umar. Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr said: This is the practice of Hercules and Caesar, kings of Rome. Marwan said: Abdur Rahman is one about whom the following verse is revealed:
>
> "And he who says to his parents: Fie on you!" (Surah Ahqaf 46:17)

This was reported to Ayesha and she said: By God, Marwan is a liar...the Messenger of Allah (s) cursed the father of Marwan (Hakam bin Aas) while Marwan was in his loins; therefore, a part of the curse reached Marwan.[30]

Curse on Hakam bin Abil Aas and his progeny is also narrated from Imam Hasan (a):

> It is narrated from Abu Yahya that it was decided between Hasan and Husain (a) on one side and Marwan bin Hakam on the other that the two groups would curse each other. Marwan said: You are an accursed family. Hasan (a) became infuriated and said: Why called us an accursed family? By Allah, you were cursed by the Messenger of Allah (s) when you were in the loins of your father.[31]

3- Abu Sufyan 4- Yazid bin Abu Sufyan 5- Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan

Bazzar, a senior Ahle Sunnat scholar, says:

> The Messenger of Allah (s) was seated when he saw a man mounted on a camel and another person holding the reins of the camel and another fellow driving the beast from rear. His Eminence said: May the Almighty Allah curse the rider of the camel, one holding the reins and the one driving it from rear.[32]

Abu Sufyan and his two sons are the same accursed tree in Quran

The book of *Tarikh Tabari* has introduced the three persons mentioned before, who are cursed in the traditional report of the Messenger of Allah (s) and Tabari says:

> There is no difference of opinion regarding the fact that the implication of the 'accursed tree' in Holy Quran is Bani Umayyah clan. And among the instances of cursing Bani Umayyah is the statement of the Messenger of Allah (s) when Abu Sufyan was mounted on a camel and Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan was leading it and Yazid bin Abu Sufyan was driving it from the rear. His Eminence had said: May Allah curse the puller, the rider and the driver of the camel.[33]

Exclusive cursing of Muawiyah from the Prophet

Though in the above mentioned reports, the name of Muawiyah is mentioned among those who were cursed by the Messenger of Allah (s), in other reports, he is cursed exclusively by the Prophet:

> Ibne Abbas says: I was playing with young children when the Prophet was passing by. I concealed myself behind the door, but the Prophet came after me, tapped me and said: Go and call Muawiyah to me. I

went to Muawiyah and informed him about the order of the Prophet, but since he was busy eating, he continued without paying any attention. When the Prophet was told about this, he cursed Muawiyah and said: May the Almighty Allah never fill up his stomach.[34]

Fulfillment of the curse of the Prophet (s) for Muawiyah

Balazari has written and his book:

One day the Prophet (s) summoned Muawiyah, but he delayed in coming. His Eminence cursed him and said: May Allah never fill up his stomach. Muawiyah himself said: The curse of the Prophet has been fulfilled regarding me, that is why I eat more or less seven times a day.[35]

Tabari has also said:

The Messenger of Allah (s) said: May the Almighty Allah never fill up the stomach of Muawiyah. It was because of this that he was never satiated and always said: By Allah, I don't stop eating because I am satiated; I do so because of fatigue.[36]

Dhahabi, who is the most prominent Ahle Sunnat scholar of the science of narrators, says:

The Prophet (s) on the third time (he summoned Muawiyah, but he didn't respond) said: May Allah not satiate his appetite. Due to this he was never again satiated.[37]

Many other Wahabi scholars, like Ibne Kathir etc. have also stated regarding this in their books.

The Prophet approved his one wife curse another

Apart from the fact whether these reports are genuine or not, we consider such reports to be against the respect of the Prophet of Islam (s).[38] It is narrated in *Sahih Bukhari, Sahih*

Muslim and other books of *Sihah Sitta* of Ahle Sunnat that Zainab binte Jahash spoke ill of the wives of the Prophet (s) to Ayesha, in the presence of His Eminence. And Ayesha also as per the orders of the Prophet replied to Zainab and His Eminence was pleased with Ayesha upon her bad mouthing and he encouraged her:

> It is narrated from Ayesha that: The wives of Allah's Apostle were in two groups. One group consisted of Ayesha, Hafsa, Safiyya and Sauda; and the other group consisted of Umme Salama and the other wives of Allah's Apostle... They then sent Zainab binte Jahash, who went to him and used harsh words saying, "Your wives request you to treat them and the daughter of Ibne Abu Qahafa on equal terms." On that she raised her voice and abused Ayesha to her face so much so that Allah's Apostle looked at Ayesha to see whether she would retort. Ayesha started replying to Zainab till she silenced her. The Prophet then looked at Ayesha and said, "She is really the daughter of Abu Bakr."[39]

It is clear that such reports have been fabricated to prove the excellence of Ayesha, but at what cost?

Approval of the Messenger of Allah (s) on the abusing of Abu Bakr

According to Ahle Sunnat reports, a person abused Abu Bakr in the presence of the Prophet (s), but His Eminence did not refrain him in any way. When Abu Bakr was fed up with it, he abused that man in response, but the Messenger of Allah (s) upon this act of Abu Bakr stood up and left the place. The text of the report is as follows:

> While the Messenger of Allah (s) was seated, a person abused Abu Bakr, and he watched in approval. When the abusing of that man crossed the limit, Abu Bakr

> returned some of his abuses back to him. This infuriated the Messenger of Allah (s). He stood up. Abu Bakr went after His Eminence and said: O Messenger of Allah (s), he was abusing me and you watched as audience, but when I responded with some of his abuses, you became infuriated and left the gathering?[40]

And there are many other instances, which we have abstained from quoting for the sake of brevity.

POLEMICAL REPLY

A. If cursing the companions is appalling, why Muawiyah cursed and abused Amirul Momineen (a)?

With attention to the reports, which state that the Messenger of Allah (s) said: One, who cursed Ali, has in fact cursed me and prominent Ahle Sunnat scholars have considered the chain of narrators of this report to be correct. What meaning can the cursing of Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) by a person like Muawiyah have?

Muslim in his *Sahih*, which is the most reliable book of traditions after the Holy Quran,[41] has mentioned the following report:

> Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan ordered Saad Ibne Abi Waqqas [to talk ill of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a)], but he refrained from this act. Muawiyah asked: What restrains you from abusing Abu Turab [Amirul Momineen (a)]? Saad Ibne Abi Waqqas replied: Three merits of Ali (a), which I heard from the Messenger of Allah (s), such that even if one of them had been for me, I would have valued it more than red haired camels.[42]

There many such reports like the above mentioned one, but we have refrained from quoting more for the sake of brevity and it

only proves the order of Muawiyah to curse, but Ibne Abi Shaybah on the above point narrates through genuine chains of narrators that Muawiyah himself abused Amirul Momineen (a):

> Saad Ibne Abi Waqqas, in one of his Hajj journeys, visited Muawiyah; someone mentioned Ali (a) in the conversation, but Muawiyah abused him! Saad became angry at this and he said: Why do say such a thing about Ali (a)? But Allah, I have heard three qualities of his from the Messenger of Allah (s), such that even if one of them had been for me, it would have been preferable to me from all the world and whatever it contains. 1. The Prophet said: Of whomsoever I am the Master, this Ali is also his master. 2. Your position to me is same at that of Harun to Musa, with the difference that after me, there is no prophethood. 3. And he said: Tomorrow I would give the standard to one whom Allah and His Messenger love.[43]

There are many other traditions as well, which prove that Muawiyah abused Ali, in addition to the instances we have mentioned above.

B. If cursing of companions is immoral, why Ayesha...?

In the same way, we see that Amirul Momineen (a) was being abused and cursed in the presence of Ayesha, but she did not raise any objection:

> It is narrated from Ata bin Yasar that a person came to Ayesha and in her presence abused Ali (a) and Ammar Yasir. Ayesha said: I don't have any comments about Ali (a); but as for Ammar, I have heard from the Messenger of Allah (s) that he said: If he is given choice between two acts, he will choose the best of them.[44]

NOTES

[1] Abuse denotes using foul epithets about a person.

[2] *Al-Mukhtasar fee Akhbaaral Bashar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 250, Abul Fida, Imaduddin Ismail bin Ali (732 A.H.);

Al-Kamil fit Tarikh, Vol. 8, Pg. 114, Abul Hasan Ali bin Abi Karam Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Abdul Karim Shaibani (d. 630 A.H.), Edited: Abdullah Qadi, Darul Kutubal Ilmiya – Beirut, Second edition, 1415 A.H.

[3] Innumerable insults of Ibne Taymiyyah and many other Wahabis scholars as also their verdicts labeling Shia as apostates can be referred in our book of *Shakh Shaitan* (Analysis and research on the deviated sect of Wahabis), in part 7, Pg. 358 by the same author. For example the above mentioned person in one of his insults addressed to the Shia says:

In case we have to consider Shia among the quadrupeds, we have to consider them as asses and if we are to consider them as birds we have to consider them as filth eating birds.

Minhajus Sunnah, Vol. 1, Pg. 55, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Harrani Abul Abbas (d. 728 A.H.), Mausisa Qurtuba – 1406, First edition, Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Salim.

Or at another occasion, he says:

Rafida (Shia) are the worst sect related to the Holy Kaaba.

[4] *Minhajus Sunnatun Nabawiya*, Vol. 4, Pg. 46, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Abul Abbas Harrani (d. 728 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Salim, Mausisa Qurtuba, First edition, 1406 A.H.

[5] Some other verdicts labeling Shia as apostates can be referred to in *Shakh Shaitan* (Analysis and research on the deviated Wahabi sect in the seventh part) by this same author. Pg. 358 For example, he says in the verdict against Shia Hezbollah of Lebanon as follows:

It is in no way lawful to support and defend the Hezbollah or to pray for their victory and all Ahle Sunnat should express disdain for this party and anyone who follows their views is from them and he is condemned. And they explain that Shia, since the ancient times were enemies of Islam and tried to harm Ahle Sunnat and one who befriends the Shia has befriended an enemy of Islam and in this he would be included among the enemies of Islam.

Shaykh Abdullah bin Jabrin, Verdict no. 15903, dated 21/6/1427 A.H. (26/5/85 – 17/7/2006), www.islamlight.net

[6] *Al-Lulu al-Makeen min Fatawi Fadhila*, Shaykh Ibne Jibrin, Pg. 39

[7] For information about this person and his hatred to Shia scholars and Shia Jurisprudents (*Maraja*), please refer to the book of *Shakh Shaitan* (Analysis and research on the deviated sect of Wahabis), in part 7, Pg. 358 by the same author. For example, he says in one of his verdicts against Shia scholars:

Although we may have doubts about disbelief of general public and ordinary Shia, but with regard to considering Shia scholars and jurisprudents (*Maraja*) we have no doubt.

Shakh Shaitan. Second edition, Part 2, Pg. 74, Sayyid Mujtaba Aseeri.

[8] *Al-Uqudud Dariya fee Tanqihul Fatawiul Hamidiya*, Pg. 102-103

[9] Refer to the Turathuna Journal, Vol. 6, Pg. 32 Mauqafush Shia min Hajamat Khusum

[10] *Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 7, Pg. 36, Abul Fadhl Ahmad bin Ali bin Hajar Asqalani Shafei (d. 852 A.H.), Darul Marifa, Beirut – 1379, Edited: Muhibuddin Khatib.

[11] *Usulus Sarkhi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 134, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Abi Sahl Sarkhi (d. 490, Darul Marifa – Beirut.

[12] *Al-Bahrul Raiq Sharh Kanzul Daqaiq*, Vol. 5, Pg. 136. Zainuddin Ibne Nujaim Hanafi (d. 970 A.H.), Darul Marifa – Beirut, Second edition.

[13] *Al-Muhalli*. Vol. 11, Pg. 414, Abu Muhammad Ali bin Ahmad bin Saeed bin Jazm Zahiri (d. 456). Darul Afaaqul Jadida – Beirut, Edited: Lijna Ahya Turathul Arabi.

[14] *Alqamul Hajar Liman Zaka Saab Abi Bakr wa Umar*, Pg. 66, Edited: Marzuq Ali Ibrahim.

[15] *Minhajus Sunnatun Nabawiya*, Vol. 4, Pg. 46, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Abul Abbas Harrani (d. 728 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Salim, Mausisa Qurtuba, First edition, 1406 A.H.

[16] *Al-Muhalli*, Vol. 10, Pg. 484, Abu Muhammad Ali bin Ahmad bin Saeed bin Hazm Zahiri, (d. 456), Darul Afaqul Jadida, Beirut – Edited: Lajna Ahya Turathul Arabi.

[17] *Kitabul Imam ash-Shafei*, Vol. 4, Pg. 229, *Mukhtasar Mazni* of Ismail Mazni, Pg. 256 – *Al-Majmua Nawawi*, Vol. 19, Pg. 197 – *Mughniul Mohtaj* of Muhammad bin Sharbini, Vol. 4, Pg. 124 – *Al-Jawharul Naqi* of Mardini, Vol. 8, Pg. 58.

[18] *Minhajus Sunnatun Nabawiya*, Vol. 7, Pg. 153, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Harrani Abul Abbas (d. 728 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Saalim, Mausisa Qurtuba, First edition, 1406 A.H.

[19] *Minhajus Sunnatun Nabawiya*, Vol. 5, Pg. 47, Ahmad bin Abdul Halim bin Taymiyyah Harrani Abul Abbas (d. 728 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Muhammad Rishad Saalim, Mausisa Qurtuba, First edition, 1406 A.H.

[20] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 3, Pg. 1335, Kitab Fadhailus Sahaba, Baad Fadahail Ashabun Nabi, Muhammad bin Ismail Abu Abdullah Bukhari Jofi (d. 256 A.H.), Edited: Dr. Mustafa Dibul Bagha, Daar Ibne Kathir, Yamama, Beirut, 3rd edition, 1407 – 1987.

[21] *Al-Faraaul Hanbali*, Vol. 3, Pg. 988 – Usudul Ghaba, Vol. 1, Pg. 1, *Al-Iqdah fi Usulul Fiqh*.

[22] *Al-Jamiul Akhlaqur Rawi wa Aadabus Sami*, Vol. 2, Pg. 293, Ahmad bin Ali bin Thabit Khatib Baghdadi Abu Bakr (d. 463), Maktaba Marif – Riyadh – 1403, Edited: Dr. Mahmud Tahan – *Talqih Fahoom Ahlul Athar*, Ibne Jauzi, Vol. 1, Pg. 73 – *Tadribul Rawi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 220

[23] *Al-Jamiul Ahkaamul Quran* (Tafsir Qurtubi), Vol. 16, Pg. 299, Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Ahmad Ansari Qurtubi (d. 671 A.H.), Daarul Sha-ab, Cairo.

[24] *Lisanul Arab*, Vol. 13, Pg. 987, Muhammad bin Mukarram bin Manzur Afriqi Misri (d. 711 A.H.), Daar Sadir, Beirut, 1st edition;

Sihah Jauhari, Vol. 6, Pg. 2196 - *Lisanul Arab*, Vol. 3, Pg. 387

[25] *Tajul Uroos min Jawahiral Qamus*, Vol. 3, Pg. 34, Muhammad Murtaza Husain Zubaidi (d. 1205 A.H.), Edited: Majmua min Muhaqqaqeen, Daarul Hidaya.

[26] *Tajul Uroos min Jawahiral Qamus*, Vol. 32, Pg. 453, Muhammad Murtaza Husain Zubaidi (d. 1205 A.H.), Edited: Majmua min Muhaqqaqeen, Daarul Hidaya.

[27] *"And do not abuse those whom they call upon besides Allah, lest exceeding the limits they should abuse Allah out of ignorance." (Surah Anam 6:108)*

[28] *"So Allah's curse is on the unbelievers." (Surah Baqarah 2:89)*

[29] *"Surely (as for) those who speak evil things of Allah and His Apostle, Allah has cursed them in this world and the hereafter, and He has prepared for them a chastisement bringing disgrace." (Surah Ahzab 33:57)*

[30] *Sunan Nasai Kubra*, Vol. 6, Pg. 458, No. 11491, Ahmad bin Shuaib Abu Abdur Rahman Nasai (d. 303 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, 1411 A.H. 1991 A.D. First edition, Edited: Dr. Abdul Ghaffar Sulaiman Bandari, Sayyid Kasrawi Hasan.

[31] *Musnad Abi Yaala*, Vol. 12, Pg. 135, No. 6764, Ahmad bin Ali bin Masanna Abu Yaala Musuli Tamimi (d. 307 A.H.), Darul Mamunun Turath, Damascus, 1404 A.H. 1984 A.D. First edition, Edited: Husain Salim Asad

Musnad Bazzar, Vol. 6, Pg. 241, No. 2273 – *Majmauz Zawaid*, Vol. 10, Pg. 72 – *Fathul Bari*, Vol. 8, Pg. 577 – *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 8, Pg. 259 – *Seer Alaamun Nubla*, Vol. 3, Pg. 478 – *Gharibul Hadith* of Ibne Jauzi, Vol. 2, Pg. 197 – *Al-Matlibul Aaliya*, Vol. 18, Pg. 267.

[32] *Musnad Bazzar (Bahrul Zakhair)*, Vol. 9, Pg. 286, No. 3839, Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Amr bin Abdul Khaliq bin Bazzar (d. 292 A.H.), Mausisatul Uloomul Quran, Maktaba al-Uloom wal Hikam, Beirut, Medina – 1409, First edition, Edited: Dr. Mahfuzur Rahman Zainullah.

Haithami has considered this report as authentic:

Majmauz Zawaid wa Manbaul Fawaid, Vol. 1, Pg. 113, Ali bin Abu Bakr Haithami (d. 807), Darul Riyanut Turath, Darul Kitabul Arabi, Cairo, Beirut, 1407.

[33] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 5, Pg. 621, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut.

[34] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 4, Pg. 2010, Tr. 2604, Book 45; Kitab Birr wa Silatul Aadab, Baab man lanatun Nabi..., Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

Other points about narration of this report may be found in book of

Payambar Wahabiyat (in two parts and three sections, 185 pages), footnotes to Introduction.

[35] *Futuhul Buldan*, Balazari, Vol. 3, Pg. 582, Edited: Nashr Walhaq wa Fehrist, Dr. Salahuddin Munjid, Maktaba Nahzatal Misriya, Cairo.

[36] *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 8, Pg. 186, Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari (d. 310 A.H.), Nakhbatal minal Ulama wal Ajla, Darul Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, Lebanon.

[37] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 3, Pg. 123, Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala, Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

[38] Some of these reports, which cast aspersion on the holiness of the Messenger of Allah (s), which are misused by orientalists and for condemnation and caricature by Europeans in recent times, *Payambar Wahabiyat* (some insulting verdicts of the chief jurists of Saudi Arabia based on the authority of the reports of *Sahih Bukhari* and *Muslim* in Pg. 185) from the same author, may be referred.

[39] *Al-Jami as-Sahih al-Mukhtasar (Sahih Bukhari)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 911, Tr. no. 2442, Kitabul Hiba, Baab Man Ahadal Ila Sahibihi wa Taharri Ba'z Nisahihi Doona Ba'az.

[40] *Musnad Imam Ahmad Hanbal*, Vol. 2, Pg. 436, No. 9622, Ahmad bin Hanbal Abu Abdullah Shaibani (d. 241 A.H.), Mausasatur Qurtuba – Egypt.

Authorities of this report and other reports of the same topic:

Sunan Abi Dawood, Vol. 4, Pg. 436, No. 4896 & 4897, Baab fil Intisar – *Musnad Bazzar*, Vol. 15, Pg. 157, No. 8495 – *Mojamul Ausat*, Vol. 7, Pg. 189, No. 7239 – Itiqad Ahle Sunnat of Allalkai, Vol. 7, Pg. 1257, No.2369 – *Tafsir Thalabi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 167 – *Shobul Eimaan*, Baihaqi, Vol. 5, Pg. 284, No. 6669 – *Al-Aadabul Baihaqi*, Vol. 1, Pg. 160 – *Kitabul Asmaul Mub-hama*, Vol. 3, Pg. 164 – *Riyadhun Nazara*, Vol. 2, Pg. 152, No. 626 & 627 – *Tafsir Thalabi*, Vol. 3, Pg. 168 – *Durre Manthur*, Vol. 7, Pg. 360 and...

[41] Ahle Sunnat scholars consider two books: *Sahih Muslim* and *Bukhari* as equals to Quran or 'brother of Quran' and the most authentic tradition book after Quran. That is why every year like the Quran is recited they have gatherings of recitation of *Sahih Bukhari*.

In the same way, they believe that the traditional reports of these two books are needless of every kind of research into their chains of narrators and such an act is unlawful, because such an act is in fact an act of heresy.

The following principle is among the principles that have dominated Ahle Sunnat people and their scholars since centuries: A report quoted by Bukhari and Muslim has crossed the bridge of authenticity and reliability. (*Irwaul Ghaleel*, Muhammad Nasir Alabani, Vol. 5, Pg. 310)

More detailed and complete points regarding these two books and other books of *Sihah Sitta* of Ahle Sunnat are mentioned in the book of *Shakh Shaitan* (Analysis and research on the deviated Wahabi sect in the seventh part) by this same author. Refer to part five, first footnote.

[42] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 7, Pg. 120, Tr. 4420, Kitab Fadhailus Sahaba, Baab Min Fadhail Ali Ibne Abi Talib (r).

[43] *Musannaf Ibne Abi Shaybah*, Vol. 6, Pg. 366, No. 32078, Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abi Shaybah Kufi (d. 235), Maktaba Rushd, Riyadh 1409, First edition, Edited: Kamaal Yusuf Alhut.

[44] *Musnad Ahmad Hanbal*, Vol. 6, Pg. 113, No. 24864, Ahmad bin Hanbal Abu Abdullah Shaibani (d. 241 A.H.), Mausasatur Qurtuba – Egypt.

OBJECTION 22:
DID THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH (S) POSSESS SONOGRAPHY FACILITY?

PATTERN OF OBJECTION

Among the Wahabi satellite networks, the most active against Shia, is the most popular of them in the world having broadcasting center in London and named as Al-Mustaqila, which has in recent years, unleashed widespread propaganda against Shia.

This network, before the arrival of 'Days of Fatima' in 1386 solar year, for a long time and through widespread propaganda in form of subtitles, day and night, in all their programs, laid great emphasis on this topic. They announced: This year we shall invite a group of religious experts to once and for all prove false the claim of Shia regarding the martyrdom of Fatima, daughter of the Messenger of Allah (s). These claims would be refuted and we will prove that Shia do not even have a single authentic report to prove their stance. In this way we will put an end to the annual Azadari ceremonies during 'Days of Fatima'.

Some days before announcing its program, this network announced: If from the Shia one can represent them to defend the claim of Shia about the martyrdom of Lady Fatima (s), we welcome him to take part in these programs and arrange debates.

Senior Shia personalities were informed of this, because this network was instigating the religious sentiments of Shia and Sunni and creating differences in Muslim society. Initially they did not pay attention and overlooked the poisonous publicity of this network; but when this network brought a

scholar-looking man disguised as a Shia to make false attributions to Shia, it was from this point that some supreme jurists (*Maraja Taqlid*) and senior personalities of religious seminaries of Qom, including His Eminence, Ayatullah Uzma Makarim Shirazi, decided to depute Ayatullah Dr, Husaini Qazwini to this network and inform its viewers about the true beliefs of Shia and also participate in this debate to neutralize the recent conspiracy of Wahabis in creating controversy between Shia and Sunni and present the traditional reports proving the martyrdom of Lady Fatima Zahra (s) in that program before all the Muslims of the world.

The objections mentioned in that programs with perfect impudence and audacity, regarding the martyrdom of Lady Zahra (s), were in fact not objections, but audacity and insult to the holy being of the Holy Prophet (s). It was nonsensical talk, which came from a Wahabi participant in this debate, named Abu Shawarib from Egypt:

> This Mohsin, which Shia say that the Messenger of Allah (s) named as Mohsin and who was martyred during the attack on the house of Fatima. How the Prophet came to know about the birth of this child years before the event and he named him Mohsin? Did anyone inform him about it or that the Prophet was having facility of sonography that he saw this child in the womb and also named him as Mohsin.

Below we present some replies of our respected teacher Ayatullah Husaini Qazwini, which were set forth in this program:

LOGICAL REPLY

In reply to such insulting statements of Wahabis, which deny the existence of His Eminence, Mohsin and his martyrdom, some views present in books accepted as authentic by Wahabis are mentioned below:[1]

1- Hafiz Jamaluddin Mizzi (d. 742 A.H.) has said:
Mohsin was still born.[2]

2- Masudi Shafei says in *Athbatul Wasiyya*:
They crushed the chief of the ladies of the world between the door and the wall till Mohsin was miscarried.[3]

3- Dhahabi says in the life sketch of Abi Daram:
Ibne Abi Daram was a person, who throughout his life lived a moderate life, but in the last days of his life, the best thing, which is read about him are the reports of defects. He was present and the following report was read to him: Umar kicked at the side of Fatima and caused miscarriage of Mohsin.[4]

4- Nazzam says:
On the day of allegiance, Umar hit at the belly of Fatima, which caused the miscarriage of Mohsin.[5]

5- And also the report of Juwaini, which we mentioned before:
When I see Fatima (s), I am reminded of the tragedies that are to befall her after my passing away. As if I can see with my own eyes, that disrespect has entered her house, her sanctity is destroyed, her right has been usurped, she is deprived of her inheritance, her side is broken and her unborn son is killed in the womb.[6]

6- In the same way, Ibne Qutaibah has mentioned this subject, but dishonest hands in recent years have deleted it. Please pay attention to this statement of Ibne Qutaibah, which is mentioned in Shia and Sunni books:

After the Holy Prophet (s), Fatima (s) had a miscarriage in which she lost a male child, whom His Eminence had named as Mohsin.

But none of the other scholars have narrated this matter.

Kifayatul Talib of Ganji Shafei, Pg. 411, Haidariya, Najaf Ashraf, in the Chapter of the number of his children.

Ibne Shahr Ashob has mentioned this issue in his *Manaqib* and said:

> Among the sons of Fatima (s) are Hasan, Husain and Mohsin, who was stillborn and it is mentioned in the book of *Marifal Qutaibi* that Mohsin was still born as a result of the injury caused by Qunfadh Adawi to Fatima.[7]

But now we see that the book of Ibne Qutaibah has been distorted and in its place they have instead mentioned the following report:

> As for Mohsin bin Ali, he died during his childhood.[8]

7- Al-Malati Shafei (d. 377 A.H.) in the book of *Al-Tanbih wa Radd*, Pg. 25 and 26.

8- Al-Aqqad and others in the book of *Fatima Zahra (s) and the Fatimids*, Pg. 68.

9- Al-Umari Nisaba (d. 490 A.H.) in the books of *Al-Majdi* and *Ansabut Talibiyyin*, Pg. 19

10- Ibne Abil Hadid (d. 656 A.H.) in *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 2, Pg. 60.

11- *Matalibus So-ool fee Manaqib Aale Rasool (s)*, Chapter 11 on the children of Fatima (s), Pg. 62 and his book of *Kashful Ghumma*, Vol. 1, Pg. 441.

12- Al-Hasani Faasi Makki (d. 832 A.H.) has said:

> And no child was born after Mohsin as Mohsin was stillborn.[9]

13- Ibrahim Tarbulusi Hanafi (d. 841 A.H.) has said in the book of *Shajarah*:

Mohsin, the son of Fatima, was stillborn and some have said that he died in his childhood, but the fact is that he was stillborn.[10]

14- Safoori Shafei (d. 894 A.H.) has said:

Fatima had five children: Hasan, Husain, Mohsin who was stillborn...[11]

15- Imam Jamaluddin Yusuf Muqaddasi (d. 909 A.H.) has said:

Regarding Mohsin, they have said that he was stillborn and according to another view, it is also said that he died in childhood, but the fact is that Fatima lost him in miscarriage.[12]

16- Muhammad Sabban (d. 1206 A.H.) has said:

...and as for Mohsin, he was stillborn.[13]

17- Shaykh Hasan Adawi Hamzawi (13th century) has said:

...and as for Mohsin, he was stillborn.[14]

POLEMICAL REPLY

In the same way, this statement of Abu Shawarib Wahabi can be studied in polemical reply in two parts:

A. Was Abu Bakr having sonography facility?

Wahabis have considered this as an excellence of Abu Bakr and have no doubt in it.

Pay attention to the following text mentioned in sources approved by Wahabis:

Malik has narrated in *Muwattah* from Ayesha that she said:

Abu Bakr gifted his orchard having twenty date trees to Ayesha and when his end approached, he said to her: My daughter, by God, nothing after my death that you are

> having is more valuable to me and nothing is harder for me than your poverty. You have received twenty date trees from me that if from them you raise other trees also it would be for you and today all my properties are there for my successors; that is your two brothers and two sisters. You must distribute them according to the Book of Allah. Ayesha said: Father, I don't have more than one sister and she is Asma. Who is the other sister? Abu Bakr said: Kharija (my slave girl) is pregnant with another daughter whom I can see.[15]

And also in many other sources, the same matter is mentioned. Now, we put the same question to Abu Shawarib Wahabi: Is Abu Bakr having sonography facility that he has given this information?

B. Is the giving of information of unseen by Umar bin Khattab not astounding?

Secondly, with regard to some companions, they have narrated that they even spoke to angels and gave information of unseen. Were those companions able to give information of unseen, but the Messenger of Allah (s) could not give information about Mohsin and his martyrdom? Why Wahabis scholars don't have any objection against the conveying of information of unseen by other companions?

A- For example:

> The Holy Prophet (s) said: In the past nations, there were persons who gave information of the unseen and if there is such a person in my Ummah, it is Umar. As if revelation comes to him and the Almighty Allah and the angels speak to him and it is narrated that Abu Bakr said: It came to my mind that the child that Asma was supposed to give birth to would be a daughter and if does not happen, the inspiration would be useless.[16]

Like the report mentioned above there are innumerable reports with same subject matter in authentic books of Ahle Sunnat. For example it is mentioned in *Sahih Muslim* as follows:

Ayesha has narrated from the Holy Prophet (s) that he said:

> In the past nations there were persons who gave information of the unseen and if there is such a person in my Ummah, it is Umar.[17]

B- Story of the call of Umar from Medina and it being heard by Muslim fighters in Fasa Shiraz is a well known story, which is mentioned in numerous books accepted by Wahabis and such is the popularity of this incident that it is also mentioned in books of grammar, but we would quote it from the book of *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya* of Ibne Kathir Damishqi Wahabi:

> Sariya bin Zaneem went on an expedition to Shiraz and launched an attack, but the soldiers of Fars and Kurd arrayed their ranks against him and a large number of them surrounded the Muslims. That night Umar saw their battle and their number in dream and became apprehensive of their consequences; that what they will do in the wilderness the following day. And there was a mountain in that place that if the Muslims take its support they would only have to be cautious from one side. The following day Umar summoned everyone to the Masjid and spoke to the people and informed them of what he had seen; then he called out to them from that same spot: O Sariya bin Zaneem, the mountain, the mountain. Then he turned to the people and said: The Almighty Allah is having soldiers who might perhaps convey this information to them. Muslims present in that battle did what Umar had said and the Almighty Allah also granted victory to them over the enemies and they conquered that city.[18]

There are many other sources approved and accepted by Wahabis, which contain the text of the same incident.[19]

C. Story of River Nile accepting the order of Umar, which Fakhre Raazi has mentioned in his *Tafsir*:

> It is narrated that during the period of ignorance the flow of River Nile in Egypt used to stop every year once and it did not restart till a beautiful female child was not thrown into it. After the advent of Islam, Amr Aas mentioned this matter to Umar and Umar wrote on a slab: O flow of Nile, if you flow by the power of Allah, continue to flow and if you are flowing with your own power, we are not in need of you. After this slab was thrown into the Nile, it restarted and never stopped again.[20]

D- Story of earthquake in Medina and fear of the whip of Umar, which is mentioned by Fakhre Raazi:

> An earthquake started in Medina. Umar hit the earth with his whip and said: O earth, take it easy by the permission of Allah, and the earth fell quiet and after that no earthquake ever occurred in Medina.[21]

E- Story of fire accepting the order of Umar:

> There was a fire in some houses of Medina. Umar wrote as follows on a slab: O fire, stop by the command of Allah, and threw in into the fire and the fire was extinguished.[22]

There are many other instances also, which are mentioned in Ahle Sunnat sources among merits of companions and none are objected to. So it is necessary to ask Abu Shawarib Wahabi: Why have you not raised objection against any of them?

NOTES

[1] Sources and references in another part of this same book, under the topic of Objection: 19, which was related to the marriage of Umar and Umme Kulthum.

[2] *Tahdhibul Kamaal*, Vol. 20, Pg. 479

[3] *Asbatul Wasiyya*, Masudi, Pg. 143

[4] *Seer Aalamun Nubla*, Vol. 15, Pg. 578, Shamsuddin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Uthman bin Qaimaz Dhahabi, Abu Abdullah, (d. 748), Mausisatur Risala. Beirut, 1413, Ninth edition, Edited: Shuaib Arnaut, Muhammad Naeem Arqasusi.

Mizanul Etedal, Biography no. 551, Ahmad bin Muhammad Sari bin Yahya bin Abi Daram al-Muhaddith. Vol. 1, Pg. 283; *Lisanul Mizan*, Vol. 1, Pg. 268, Biography no. 824, Ahmad bin Muhammad.

[5] *Al-Wafi bil Wafiyat*, Vol. 5, Pg. 347, – *Al-Milal wan Nihal*, Shahristani, Vol. 1, Pg. 57, Darul Marifa, Beirut.

[6] *Faraidus Simtain*, Vol. 2, Pg. 34-35.

[7] *Manaqib Aale Abi Talib*, Vol. 3, Pg. 358

[8] *Al-Marif*, Ibne Qutaibah, Pg. 211

[9] *Al-Iqdul Thameen fee Akhbaral baladul Ameen*, Vol. 6, Pg. 293

[10] *Masaatuz Zahra*, Vol. 2, Pg. 131 – *An Awlad Imam Ali*, Pg. 46

[11] *Nuzhatul Majalis*, Vol. 2, Pg. 194, Darul Jeel, Pg 579

[12] *Ash-Shajarah Nabawiyyah fee Nasab Khairul Bariyya*, Pg. 60, Damascus.

[13] *Isafur Raghibeen* on the margins of *Nurul Absar*, Pg. 93

[14] *Mashariqul Anwaar fee Fauz Ahlal Etebar*, Pg. 133

[15] *Muwattah Imam Malik*, Vol. 2, Pg. 752. No. 1438, Malik bin Anas Abu Abdullah Asbahi (d. 179 A.H.), Dar Ahya Turathul Arabi, Egypt, Edited: Muhammad Fawad Abdul Baqi.

[16] *Qawatiul Adla fil Usul*, Vol. 2, Pg. 349, Abul Muzaffar Mansur bin Muhammad bin Abdul Jabbar Samani (d. 489 A.H.), Darul Kutub Ilmiya, Beirut, 1418 A.H. - 1997 A.D. Edited: Muhammad Hasan Ismail Shafei.

[17] *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 4, Pg. 1864, Tr. no. 2398, Bk. 44, Fadhailus Sahaba, Chap. 1, Baab min Fadhail Abu Bakr, Muslim bin Hajjaj Abul Husain Qashiri Nishapuri (d. 261 A.H.), Edited: Muhammad

Fawad Abdul Baqi, Darul Ahya Turath Arabi, Beirut.

[18] *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 7, Pg. 130, Ismail bin Umar bin Kathir Qarashi, Abul Fida (d. 774 A.H.), Maktabal Marif, Beirut.

[19] *Al-Mughni*, Abdullah bin Qudama, Vol. 10, Pg. 552 – *Al-Sharh Kabir*, Abdur Rahman bin Qudama, Vol. 10, Pg. 387 – *Faizul Qadeer Sharh Jamiul Sagheer*, Al-Manawi, Vol. 4, Pg. 664 – Tafsir Raazi, Vol. 21, Pg. 87 – *Daqaiqut Tafseer*, Ibne Taymiyyah, Vol. 2, Pg. 140 – *Usudul Ghaba*, Ibne Athir, Vol. 2, Pg. 244 – *Al-Isabah*, Ibne Hajar, Vol. 3, Pg. 5 & 6 – *Tarikh Yaqubi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 156 – *Al-Kamil Fit Tarikh*, Ibne Athir, Vol. 3, Pg. 42-43 – *Tarikhul Islam*, Dhahabi, Vol. 1, Pg. 384 – *Tarikh Ibne Khaldun*, Vol. 1, Pg. 110, *Tajul Uroos*, Zubaidi, Vol. 16, Pg. 327

[20] *Tafsir Kabir (Mafatihul Ghaib)*, Vol. 21, Pg. 74, Fakhruddin Muhammad bin Umar Tamimi Raazi Shafei (d. 604 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, 1421 A.H. – 2000 A.D., First edition.

[21] *Tafsir Kabir (Mafatihul Ghaib)*, Vol. 21, Pg. 75, Fakhruddin Muhammad bin Umar Tamimi Raazi Shafei (d. 604 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, 1421 A.H. – 2000 A.D., First edition.

[22] *Tafsir Kabir (Mafatihul Ghaib)*, Vol. 21, Pg. 75, Fakhruddin Muhammad bin Umar Tamimi Raazi Shafei (d. 604 A.H.), Darul Kutubul Ilmiya, Beirut, 1421 A.H. – 2000 A.D., First edition.

TRAGEDIES OF DAYS OF FATIMA

1. ***Monday***: Tragic demise of the Holy Prophet (s) – formation of Saqifah Bani Saada and usurpation of Caliphate.

2. ***Tuesday***: Forcible allegiance taken from residents of Medina in favor of Abu Bakr – presence of Amirul Momineen (a) in the Prophet's mosque and his protest to the people on the matter of Caliphate - burial of the Holy Prophet (s) in loneliness and during the night.

3. ***Wednesday***: First day of compilation of Quran by Amirul Momineen (a) – first day of siege of the house of revelation.

4. ***Thursday***: Second day of compilation of Quran – Second day of the siege.

5. ***Friday***: Third day of compilation of Quran and siege of the house of revelation – contemporaneous with the first attack on the house of revelation with the aim of breaking down the siege – first round of seeking help in the night by Amirul Momineen (a) and Lady Zahra (s).

6. ***Saturday***: Days of demanding inheritance and share of near kindred by Lady Zahra (s) – second night of seeking help by Amirul Momineen (a) and Lady Zahra (s).

7. ***Sunday***: Days of demanding the inheritance and share of near kindred by Lady Zahra (s) and Amirul Momineen (a) - third round of seeking help in the night by Amirul Momineen (a) and Lady Zahra (s).

8. ***Monday***: Days of demanding the inheritance and share of near kindred by Lady Fatima (s) – disloyalty of companions in giving help to Amirul Momineen (a) – presentation of the Holy Quran by Amirul Momineen (a) to the companions and their hesitation and objection in accepting it.

9. ***Tuesday***: Days of demanding the inheritance and share of near kindred by Lady Zahra (s).

10. ***Wednesday***: Days of demanding the inheritance and share of near kindred by Lady Zahra (s).

11. ***Thursday***: Address of Lady Fatima (s) in the Prophet's Mosque.

12. ***Friday***: Twelve persons took permission from Amirul Momineen (a) and protested against Abu Bakr regarding the matter of Caliphate in the Prophet's mosque.

13. ***Saturday***: First day of the political solitude of Abu Bakr.

14. ***Sunday***: Second day of the political solitude of Abu Bakr.

15. ***Monday***: Third day of the political solitude of Abu Bakr.

16. ***Tuesday***: Re-establishment of the foundations of the regime of Abu Bakr by armed coup - expulsion of agents of Lady Zahra (s) from Fadak.

17. ***Wednesday***: The report of usurpation of Fadak reaches Lady Fatima (s) in Medina.

18. ***Thursday***: Days of demanding Fadak.

19. ***Friday***: Days of demanding Fadak.

20. ***Saturday***: Days of demanding Fadak.

21. ***Sunday***: Days of demanding Fadak – probability of real attack on this day or after that.

EPILOGUE

Dear mother Fatima! In traversing this book, I understood what all had befallen you from the calamities and unmentionable tragedies. The hand-mill is also weeping in your grief and mourning for you. My ancient, exiled, reciter of elegies, are these blue eyes filled with tears of blood. One day I will visit your tomb with your visitors beating their chests in groups.

I am thankful to the Almighty Allah that He bestowed me the good sense (*Taufeeq*) to complete this book at the beginning of the days of martyrdom of the Lady of the two worlds, chief of the women of the world, mother of her father (*Umme Abiha*), Fatima Zahra (s).

Our dear readers would be the best patrons and critics of this book; due to this, I request you to write to us your critical views and suggestions so that in the later editions we may revise the book accordingly.

If it is possible, we will print the suitable letters at the end of the book in future editions along with the name of the sender and by omitting three middle numbers and in case of need, reply to some of your views.

I adjure you by Allah, the Mighty and the High to promote and propagate this book to the audience in every manner and through every kind of support and encouragement share with us the reward of this work.

You can contact the author at:
Email: aabaad_iran@yahoo.com
Yahoo Messenger with the above id.
Phone: (0098) 9395956464

We came into this world with the name of Ali.
We will not leave it without the name of Fatima.
(Persian Couplets)

Sayyid Mujtaba Aseeri